

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 12 (legislative day of March 26), 1951:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Harry A. McDonald, of Michigan, to be a member, Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1956.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

John L. Rogers, of Tennessee, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner, term expiring December 31, 1957. (Reappointment.)

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Harley D. Nygren to be lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective March 8, 1951.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

APPOINTMENTS

To be chief boatswains

Ronald S. Jacobs
Norman A. Cooper

To be chief machinist

Alford C. Atkinson

To be chief ship's clerk

John A. Williamson

To be chief electrician

Peter S. Fredriksen, Jr.

To be chief pharmacist

Gerard A. Hearn

To be ensigns

George Peter Adamson
Earl Alexander Baker
Raymond Charles Bassett, Jr.
Henry Herbert Bell
Wilfred Robert Bleakley, Jr.
Frank Raphael Buesseler
Donald Preston Courtsal
George Thomas Doyle
Russell Harold Ferrier
John Howard Fournier
Ted Lane Gannaway
Robert Brown Grant
Graham Hall
Richard Oliver Haughey
Joseph Paul Hratko
Richard Leonard Jacobs
Byron Waver Jordan
David Murray Kaetzel
George John Kashuba
Clement Henry Edward Kerans, Jr.
John Louis Klenk
Richard Joseph Knapp
Burton Wayne Kniseley
Richard Lacy
Lambert John Larson
Raymond Peter Litts
Joseph Louzon, Jr.
Philip Charles Lutzi
Michael Joseph Madden
Richard Frank Malm
George Edward Maloney
Alfred Paul Manning, Jr.
Charles Edgar Martin
John Gazzo Martinez
Kermit Ronald Meade
Phillip Blaine Moberg
Norman Stewart Morrill
Robert Arthur Moss
Daniel Louis Muir
John Sidney Nuzum
John Stephen Phillips
Sebastian Joseph Pias
Robert Neal Pierce
Cortland Gerard Pohle, Jr.
Robert Charles Powell

James Polk Randle
Lewis Edwin Rhiver
George John Roy, Jr.
Robert Russell
Frederick Paul Schubert
John Luther Steinmetz, Jr.
Eugene Allen Stroup
Richard Marvel Thomas
Karl Beresford von Klock
Marion Long Weiss
Lawrence Arnold White
Henry Wilks, Jr.
Swain LeRoy Willson
Robert William Witter
Hugh Corbett Wyatt
Edward Franklin Yost, Jr.
Paul Alexander Yost, Jr.
Louis Locke Zumstein

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

William C. Lefebvre, Phoenix.

CALIFORNIA

Delmer C. Say, Caruthers.
George L. Busch, Ojai.
Walter D. Nicholson, Pixley.
Thomas M. Bradley, Sausalito.

COLORADO

Gertrude L. Weskamp, Crowley.
Myra Lee Orin, Elbert.
Kenneth M. Lofland, Green Mountain Falls.

FLORIDA

Mary Jane Cook, Babson Park.

IOWA

George L. Johnson, Emerson.
William Dale Rathje, Grand Mound.
Wilbur L. Hantsberger, Jr., Meriden.
Mary E. Kron, Moorhead.
Gilbert W. Christianson, Oakville.

KANSAS

Julius A. Ziegler, Collyer.
Paul H. Shepherd, Hartford.
George W. Spencer, Harveyville.
Paul L. Hatfield, Jr., Moundridge.
Lindell R. Clinkinbeard, Nortonville.

MAINE

Gladys W. Johnson, Perry.

MASSACHUSETTS

Rachel N. Lawrence, Ashby.
Hubert G. McAnespie, Collinsville.
Sophie Jurga, Shirley.

MINNESOTA

James E. Ruddy, Moorhead.

MISSOURI

Homer H. Wall, Blairtown.
Eulus W. Vaughn, Cardwell.
John B. Humphreys, Humphreys.
Robert R. Wilson, Pleasant Hope.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Nelson Liden, Hill.

NEW YORK

Helena C. Carroll, Oriskany.
William J. Cromie, Palmer.
James L. Dam, Vernon.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Vincent O. Klapperich, Turton.

TENNESSEE

James R. Wright, Trimble.

TEXAS

Edgar L. Coale, Angleton.
Frederich W. Wiedner, Cibola.
Frank C. Newbrough, Hargill.
Kenneth L. McAdoo, Higgins.
Lillian Belle Burke, La Villa.
Genevieve J. Short, Machovec.
John D. Yoakum, Milano.

VIRGINIA

William B. Newton, Ellerson.
William E. Phillips, Gladys.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, before whom the generations of men pass in triumph or in defeat and who doth preside over the destinies of all mankind, grant that in these troublous times we may seek Thy divine wisdom which is always available for those who truly desire to do Thy will.

We know not what to pray for but we are confident that Thou canst supply all our needs. Give us the humble spirit and the contrite heart.

May our beloved country ever be in the vanguard of those nations who are seeking to bring in the blessed day of peace and good will among men.

Give us the spirit of understanding and of harmony and it may be the goal of all our aspirations to build a nobler civilization.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 599. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army Air Base, New Castle, Del.;

H. R. 1249. An act for the relief of the La Fayette Brewery, Inc.;

H. R. 1479. An act for the relief of Joseph Bernstein;

H. R. 1682. An act for the relief of Capt. Marciano O. Garces;

H. R. 3020. An act to authorize the printing of the annual reports of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America as separate House documents;

H. R. 3040. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Ogden, Utah, to the Ogden Chamber of Commerce; and

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution favoring the grant of status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1822. An act for the relief of Harry C. Coakes; and

H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of Peter E. Kolesnikoff.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 11. An act to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets of persons of advanced age, mental weakness,

not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity;

S. 108. An act to amend section 28 of the Enabling Act for the State of Arizona relating to the terms of leases of State-owned lands;

S. 109. An act to protect scenic values along the Grand Canyon Park South Approach Highway (State 64) within the Kaibab National Forest, Ariz.;

S. 260. An act to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Director of Public Health of the District of Columbia;

S. 263. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the apprehension and detention of insane persons in the District of Columbia, and providing for their temporary commitment in the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes," approved April 27, 1904, as amended;

S. 362. An act for the relief of Tu Do Chau (also known as Szetu Dju or Anna Szetu);

S. 435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 470. An act for the relief of Sister Bertha Pfeiffer and Sister Elzbieta Zabinska;

S. 492. An act to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare; and for other purposes;

S. 573. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938, and for other purposes;

S. 672. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928;

S. 699. An act for the relief of James M. Shellenberger, Jr., a minor;

S. 803. An act to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General;

S. 927. An act to amend section 6 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949;

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to permit the board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to transfer certain lands to the policy jury of the parish of Rapides for use for holding livestock and agricultural exhibitions; and

S. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution directing that there shall accompany every report of a committee of conference a statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the committee.

UNITED STATES v. E. A. RUMELY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpoenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on April 13, 1951, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against E. A. Rumely, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpoena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. E. A. RUMELY, No. 1789-50
To Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK,
Room 49-G, United States Capitol:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at the District of Columbia in the city of Washington, on the 13th day of April 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify in the case of the *United States v. Rumely*.

This subpoena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL,
Clerk.

By OSCAR ALTSHULER,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpoenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on April 13, 1951, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against E. A. Rumely, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpoena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. E. A. RUMELY, No. 1789-50
To Representative CLARENCE BROWN,
House Office Building:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at the District of Columbia in the city of Washington, on the 13th day of April 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify in the case of the *United States v. Rumely*.

This subpoena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL,
Clerk.

By OSCAR ALTSHULER,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 191) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Representatives CHARLES A. HALLECK and CLARENCE J. BROWN, Members of this House, have been served with subpoenas to appear as witnesses before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at 10 a. m., on the 13th day of April 1951, in the case of the *United States v. E. A. Rumely*, Criminal Docket No. 1789-50; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK and CLARENCE J. BROWN are authorized to appear in response to the subpoenas of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States v. E. A. Rumely* at such

time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoenas of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION CONTEST—W. KINGSLAND MACY v. ERNEST GREENWOOD

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 184) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the time allowed for taking testimony in the election contest, W. Kingsland Macy, contestant, against Ernest Greenwood, contestee, First Congressional District of the State of New York, shall be extended for a period of 6 days.

That the time allowed for taking of testimony by the contestant shall be extended for a period of 6 days beginning April 16, 1951, and ending April 21, 1951.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope there will be no further extensions recommended by the committee.

Mr. STANLEY. I can say to the gentleman that it is not contemplated that the committee will give further consideration to extensions of time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 1

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill H. R. 1 have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 28]

| | | |
|------------|---------------|---------------|
| Allen, La. | Engle | Moulder |
| Armstrong | Gillette | Murdoch |
| Bolling | Goodwin | Murray, Wis. |
| Boykin | Hart | O'Konski |
| Brehm | Havenner | Ostertag |
| Brooks | Hébert | Patman |
| Buchanan | Hollifield | Rivers |
| Celler | Jones | Scott, Hardie |
| Crosser | Hamilton C. | Sieminski |
| Dawson | King | Tollefson |
| Dingell | Miller, N. Y. | Woodruff |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 431 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

UNITED STATES v. E. A. RUMELY

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpoenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify on April 13, 1951, at 10 a. m., in the case of the United States against E. A. Rumely, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpoena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. E. A. RUMELY, No. 1789-50

To Representative JOSEPH O'HARA, House Office Building:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at District of Columbia in the city of Washington on the 13th day of April 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify in the case of the United States v. Rumely.

This subpoena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.
By OSCAR ALTSHULER,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 192) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Representative JOSEPH P. O'HARA, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpoena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify at 10 a. m. on the 13th day of April 1951 in the case of the United States v. E. A. Rumely, Criminal Docket No. 1789-50; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative JOSEPH P. O'HARA is authorized to appear in response to the subpoena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the United States v. E. A. Rumely at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

1951 AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more

effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on yesterday there was pending the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Are there any amendments to the Barden amendment?

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRICE to the amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 21, line 4, after the word "hereunder", strike out the colon, insert a period, and strike out the remaining language in the section.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the committee.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make this statement for the information of the committee. I understand there are five or six very important amendments to the Barden substitute at the Clerk's desk. I hope after free debate we may be able to dispose of those amendments and dispose of the Barden bill today. If Members will remain in the Chamber, I feel confident that we can accomplish that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the information of the committee, I might add that after this bill is disposed of, there is no further legislative business for the rest of the week.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if it is not to be taken out of the gentleman's time—in answer to the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, I am especially susceptible to that—I do not know what you would call it—I will not say it.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is just a friendly observation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But listen, we had 4 days of debate last week on this bill, and most of this week. As I stated yesterday, there were at least some 375 of us here who wanted to say something about this.

I want to ask the majority leader and the chairman of the committee, Are we going to adjourn and go home or go fishing and be deprived of an opportunity to speak?

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] will permit, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that there will be no disposition on the part of the committee to insist that anybody be denied an oppor-

tunity to freely express his views or to offer any amendment he wants to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is to say, those who want to stay here and talk will be given that privilege, and those who want to go home may do so?

Mr. VINSON. I am hoping we can always have a large attendance so that Members can have a good audience to address.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that much of my time has already been used, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I am proposing this amendment to the substitute as I had intended to offer it as an amendment to the original bill, on page 53, line 19. Briefly, my amendment would strike from the substitute the language on page 21, beginning with the proviso which would reinstate the policy of segregation in the Armed Forces. My remarks will, in substance, give to the House the policy of the armed services, the Defense Establishment, in regard to this measure.

I believe the majority of the Members of this House, in the interest of national security and of morale in the services, will support my amendment. At the beginning of my remarks I want to give the committee the position of the Defense Establishment on this matter.

The adoption of a provision giving men the right to choose whether they wish to serve in segregated units and making it mandatory on the Armed Forces to carry out that choice, except where military necessity forbids, would interfere substantially with the efficient fulfillment by the services of their military missions.

I would like the House to know that that is not only my personal opinion, but that it is the opinion of the leaders of the Defense Establishment.

The following arguments that I will use are also those proposed by the Defense Establishment.

There are no segregated units in the Navy or Air Force and it would necessitate a major reorganization of both of these services to provide opportunities for segregation in training or in subsequent service assignment. Both services would be severely limited in their freedom to assign personnel where they could be used most effectively if such a requirement were written into law.

In the Army there are no segregated training divisions to which men could be sent. Outside the training divisions, where segregated Army units do exist, the proposed amendment would take control over assignment away from the Army and give it to the individual.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask the committee as to the method of writing this provision as it was submitted by the committee? How is it that you can de-

termine what the word "race" means? There are five races. What puts a person into a particular race? Is it your grandfather, your great-grandfather, who is the controlling factor? How far back does it go? I believe the gentleman is correct in his position and I favor the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PRICE. That is one of the great difficulties involved in the language as it now exists in the bill and as it is also found in the substitute. That is one reason the services are disturbed, and others are also disturbed.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman on his points.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Commanding officers would not be able to assign men where they were needed most but would be compelled to send them to segregated units unless they could find some imperative military reason for doing otherwise. Every assignment made contrary to a man's expressed wish would open up the prospect of disaffection, increased racial tension, appeals to higher authority, and lawsuits. Special difficulties would attend the assignment of men possessing critically needed skills. These assignments must be made on the basis of qualifications, rather than color. Failure to follow this practice would complicate the operating problems of military units.

Difficulties could also arise from the necessity for respecting the desire of men from relatively small racial groups to be in segregated units of their own. It would be hard to concentrate Malaysians or Mongolians, for example, in special groups if they expressed a wish for such treatment.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. The bill uses the broad term "race." Let us be perfectly frank with each other and with everybody here; is not this primarily aimed at the colored race?

Mr. PRICE. Of course it is; we all know that; certainly.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. The language which the gentleman read or by which he seeks to amend the substitute offered by me is the exact language which the Members incorporated in the draft provisions of the Vinson bill, S. 1.

Mr. PRICE. That is absolutely correct. I had intended to offer my amendment to the Vinson bill, but the substitute is now before the House and just for protection I am also offering it to the substitute.

Mr. BARDEN. I am glad the gentleman from Illinois has such strong suspicion that my substitute is going to be adopted.

Mr. PRICE. Anything may happen when the Members have the right to vote as they choose in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, the net effect of the proposed amendment would be to impair the flexibility of military assignment, with consequent great loss in the operating efficiency of the armed services.

The Armed Forces of the United States have in the past 5 years made progress away from racial segregation. No incidents of any kind have occurred to warrant a reversal of this trend. On the other hand, whenever the policy of non-segregation in the different branches of service, the morale and efficiency of the troops have been improved.

We cannot afford such a backward step as the provision now in the bill would force the services to take. That is the reason for my amendment to strike these pro-segregation features from the bill.

It was only a short time ago that we spent billions of dollars and sacrificed some of our finest citizens to destroy an arrogant dictatorship based on theories of racial superiority. Now we are fighting a new kind of war against an enemy whose chief stock in trade is a willingness to use all people, without regard to race or station, as long as they are willing to aid in establishing a world dictatorship.

The enemy we fight does not ignore the tremendous potential strength of Asia and Africa. We are not fighting in Korea for a strip of earth or a handful of trading rights. We are fighting there because we are determined that the people of the world shall be free from exploitation and all of the ugly forms of political oppression that go hand in hand with dictatorships.

Nowhere in the world is there another country that can produce more arms or braver soldiers than the United States. Our one weakness in Korea is the constant barrage of propaganda which points to the mistreatment of minority groups in the United States. This propaganda is not only used in Korea, but it is used by our enemies wherever they think it may stir up distrust and hate against us.

Therefore, from a very practical standpoint the language in the substitute and in the bill, which proposes that we continue and extend segregation of the races in the Armed Forces provides a terrible new weapon for our enemies. It is the kind of thing that forms the small core of truth for a tremendous and distorted lie.

But we in the United States have another reason for being against this amendment. Every war that we have fought has been based on our desire to win and hold democracy. In every war we have called on all of our citizens without regard to race. White men and black men have died in the uniform of our country whenever we have called

our sons to battle. Now is the time to treat all of them alike. Now is the time to keep faith with the men who died in 1917. Now is the time to salute the white and black men who mingled their blood in the defense of Pearl Harbor. We must not write requirements of segregation into the law governing our Armed Forces.

The Air Force and the Navy have made good progress in eliminating racial segregation. During World War II there were many persons who were reluctant to use colored men as pilots. Now this attitude has changed and the Air Force has done an excellent job in making full use of all citizens on a democratic basis.

The Air Force Times of February 10, 1951, reports that 95 percent of all colored people serving in the Air Force are now working in mixed units. The colored members of the Air Force work with every type of outfit from squadrons on up. They constitute about 6 percent of the total Air Force strength. These men have acquitted themselves well in battle.

Not only have the colored men who are in the Air Force done well, but I call your attention to the front page of the Washington Post of March 31, 1951. That front page carried the pictures of three American heroes of the fighting in Korea. They were Lieutenant Hudner, Ensign Brown, and Corporal Red Cloud. Lieutenant Hudner is white. Ensign Brown was colored. Corporal Red Cloud was an Indian. Last Tuesday I inserted into the RECORD the story of the heroism of these men.

I mention, particularly, Ensign Brown and Corporal Red Cloud because, under the terms of the Winstead amendment, they could be forced into segregated units for colored people and Indians.

Ensign Brown came from Hattiesburg, Miss. He was the first of the Navy's colored aviators and the first of them to lose his life in combat. At the time of his death he was flying close support for Marines fighting near the Chaugin Reservoir when his plane was hit by Chinese ack-ack fire and crashed.

Lieutenant Hudner, who was flying close support also, immediately maneuvered his plane to protect Ensign Brown from enemy troops. In other words, he risked his life to save the injured flier who was trapped alive in the burning wreckage. He also packed the fuselage with snow, using his bare hands to keep flames away from Ensign Brown, and struggled to free him. For this heroism, Lieutenant Hudner will justly receive the Congressional Medal of Honor. This is the American way in which our men should fight. We must not do anything that would substitute for this wonderful demonstration of democratic action a racist philosophy which denies men the right to be judged on the basis of ability rather than the color of skin.

Corp. Red Cloud was killed near Chongyon in North Korea while serving with the Twenty-fourth Division. He was badly hit by a burst of enemy fire but wrapped his arm around a tree to keep from falling and continued to fire an automatic rifle until he fell mortally wounded. This heroic act stopped the

enemy from overrunning his company's position and gained time for reorganization and evacuation of the wounded.

Tuesday I inserted an article from the Pittsburgh Courier which tells of the heroism of Pfc Aaron Jones, a 21-year-old native of Memphis, Tenn. The story states that—

The outstanding feature of Jones' action was the fact that he is a Browning automatic rifleman, but used unfamiliar weapons such as hand grenades, a captured rifle, and an abandoned machine gun to wreak havoc upon the enemy.

The only Negro in his nine-man squad, Jones and his comrades were part of a force assigned to take a hill on which the Chinese Red troops were dug in. Just as the signal for the charge came, his gun jammed. Not wanting to be left out of the excitement, he grabbed up some hand grenades and closed in with the rest of the outfit. Halfway up the slope the hand grenades came in handy. A burp gun, firing from above, pinned down the American attackers. Jones, with complete disregard for his life, jumped to his feet and hurled a grenade up the hill. There was an explosion, then silence, and the attack again rolled forward.

Reaching the top, the American troops locked in hand-to-hand struggle with the enemy, Jones grabbed up a rifle, a Japanese single-shot rifle, with no bullets and scurried around quickly to pick up some ammunition. When he had gotten some, he downed two of the enemy as they were running. The following day in another hill attack he spotted a Red force advancing up the other side of the slope. The regular machine gunners were eating at the time, so he took over one of the spray guns and downed 11 of the advancing enemy on the first burst.

I ask the Members to note, particularly, that Jones was the only colored man in a nine-man squad. If the Winstead amendment had been in effect, it is quite likely that Jones would not have been serving with that squad.

I wish to cite also from the Washington Star of January 25, 1951, a story concerning Pvt. Edward O. Cleaborn, Jr., of Memphis, Tenn., who single-handedly wiped out a machine-gun crew threatening his unit. I quote some of the paragraphs from this story:

In awarding him the Nation's second highest military award, Far East Command Headquarters said that Cleaborn's unit, Company A, Thirty-fourth Infantry Regiment, attacked a ridge where the enemy was occupying positions with excellent observation and fields of fire. Some of the enemy had infiltrated and flanking action had occurred and his platoon was pinned down almost immediately by machine-gun fire from the rear.

Despite the extreme hazard of interlocking machine-gun fire Cleaborn gained the ridge and killed the machine-gun crews to the front. From the continuous firing of his weapons' Cleaborn's hands were severely burned. Disregarding his burned hands, when his platoon began a withdrawal he remained on the ridge to cover withdrawal of his comrades and to permit evacuation of the wounded. He continued firing from this position, thus denying the enemy access to adjacent high ground.

While furnishing protective fire, Private Cleaborn was mortally wounded. His heroic self-sacrifice permitted the withdrawal of his platoon to new positions.

Private Cleaborn was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for giving his life to save his platoon.

We cannot breathe life into the bodies of these men who are now dead, but we

can keep alive the ideal for which they were fighting. That ideal is a democratic United States in which every citizen has the right to serve his country in time of need; in which every citizen has the right to serve his country as a man and not as a subhuman who must be segregated and set apart from his fellows.

The fine awards that have been made to these men will mean little if the Congress of the United States places beside these emblems of heroism a badge of inferiority on the breasts of colored troops.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is to strike out a provision of the bill which I offered as an amendment in the committee. I hope the House will listen to me on this question.

I regretted that it was necessary to offer such an amendment. We have fought all wars in the past with almost total segregation in the armed services. I think the military leaders should work this involved problem out according to the best interest of the service, which is exactly what my amendment does. It does not require that anyone even state a preference when he registers. It merely gives to each individual, regardless of who he is, a right to express himself when he registers as to whether or not he prefers segregation. It gives to the colored as well as the white, the Negro, or any other race of people, the same right and privilege. There is nothing demanding of the military that they carry out his wish if to do so would impair the operations of the service. We ask the military to give consideration to his desires and to use a little common sense in working out this very involved and complicated problem.

Let us see why an amendment such as this, or a provision like this, is absolutely necessary at the present time. I wonder how many Members of this Congress have read a book put out by the Committee for Equal Opportunity in the Armed Services, made public on May 22, 1950? As I said, during the last war there was hardly any integration in the armed services, and none of it forced. Today, in theory, there is no such thing as a segregated unit. In the Southern States our people, Negroes and whites, have lived together in peace and harmony and have made great progress in a peaceful way. I contend that the Negro is as much concerned about this as the whites.

Who would object to giving every American the right to express himself rather than have people, you, me, or anyone else, take the floor of this House year after year and tell the people what the Negro wants or what the white man wants? Let them speak for themselves. I think that is a fair proposition.

The President's Committee takes pride in overseeing every branch of the Armed Services and using the power of the draft backed up by the President's directive to force social changes which many do not want. It even has quotations and testimony from General Omar Bradley, from Secretary Royall, and from General Eisenhower and others. I would

like to call your attention to what General Omar Bradley said.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that is the President's Committee and that the President himself has issued a directive eliminating segregation and so has the Secretary of Defense? How can the gentleman say that the Committee has contravened what is the policy of the armed services?

Mr. WINSTEAD. The President appointed this Committee and it might not be best to bring that up, for in my opinion the best interest of the service was not the motivating force behind the Committee's action and the resulting directive. I want to say to you that this racial problem has been played with in the North, South, East, and West until it is time to stop it. I am trying to take it out from under the President's Committee and put it in the hands of the military leaders where it belongs, who will be fair. May I say that I for one want to see the Negroes have equal opportunity. What did General Bradley and General Eisenhower say about their opportunity for equal treatment?

May I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that this same Committee admits the Negro has not had the educational and training opportunity and that they cannot have equal opportunity for promotion if they are in mixed groups. Why not permit them to express a preference? Then let the military work out this problem, using common sense, and take it from these political committees that have done nothing but stir up racial hatred and racial prejudice in this country.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I would like to compliment the gentleman on his fairness and say that of all the Members of the House that I know from the South taking his position, that he is most sincere and fair in his statement, although I differ with him. May I ask this question? Where does the segregation of the unit end? Is it in the lowest ranks or does it go on up through the generals? Can a general or a colonel ask that he be segregated?

Mr. WINSTEAD. We will leave it to the individual to express himself. Of course in this bill we are dealing with draftees, which does not include officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. There is nothing compulsory on the part of the military. We are trying to give them an opportunity to use common sense and judgment to solve this involved and complicated problem. After they broke down segre-

gation in the military, the Navy, and the Air Force and Marine Corps, recruited largely through volunteer system, have only a small percentage of Negroes. They only took a handful of them. You could take probably 8 or 10 Negroes with 90 whites and work it out on a common sense basis. The Army had to resort to the draft and take a great majority of the Negroes, which gave a high percentage of Negroes in the Infantry. The Army raised the mental standards, not as a reflection on the Negro race, but with this political pressure stamped upon the necks of the military leaders, they were forced to break it down. They knew that around 30 to 40 percent of the Infantry in the Army would be composed of Negroes. They knew, furthermore, if they put them in the Infantry, 40 percent Negro and 60 percent white and forced them together under all conditions, that they would have race riots as they have had. The trouble has not yet been exposed; it is only in its infancy; yet there have been many serious difficulties which have been kept out of the press. I say if you put in the provision of lowering the mental standards to the 1945 level, you must put this provision in there to give the military the right to use some common sense and judgment in connection with this problem. The Air Force served notice on the institutions of this country that they could not participate in any kind of a military-training program where they practiced segregation. Since this committee reported this provision, 21 to 12, a few weeks ago, they have rescinded that act. The fact that I got the committee to adopt my amendment has already had this beneficial result, and, if retained, it will result in permitting the armed services to exercise common sense with regard to other matters.

I am pleading with this House. I am not reflecting upon the Negro race. I say to you that I get along with them.

I say to you that unless you leave the provision in this bill that gives the military not these political powers, but the right to use common sense and judgment in this thing, 6 or 12 months from now may be too late to correct some things about it, you may legislate in a way to further create hatred where hatred does not exist today. Certainly we will not have all segregated units; we will have only a few under this provision, and over a period of time, with common sense and judgment, the military will solve this problem in a better manner than can these political committees. It is indeed an involved and a complicated and a serious problem that we might just as well face now as any other time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This merely gives the military the right to do what they have been doing in all the wars we have gone through; is that not correct?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Yes. And I say this is American; it is democratic. Do you want special favors or do you want equal opportunity? The Negro boy has the same right as the white boy. What else do you want? I ask you in all fairness,

is it special consideration or is it equal opportunity, and that is what my provision offers, equal opportunity to all races.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman started to read a minute ago a statement by General Eisenhower and a statement by General Bradley. I hope he will not use all his time before he has an opportunity to read those.

Mr. WINSTEAD. The purpose of this amendment to the universal military training proposal has as its foundation a sincere belief that hereby a greater measure of consideration for the rights of the men inducted into military service might be accorded to all. It envisages a higher level of morale and efficiency, especially among those men who are not wholly pleased with the results of the present trends toward complete integration of all the units of the Armed Forces, regardless of race, color, and other classifications. Many persons are firmly convinced that the programs reputedly designed to grant equality to and to eliminate discrimination against various minority groups are, in reality, only political expedients and are not sincere.

The records of the committees that are appointed to study the problem of segregation in the military, educational, and other phases of our Nation's life have numerous statements by top leaders who do not favor the integration of all groups of our population at this time. They believe the present system of separating people according to differences in race and cultural background serves the best interests of all concerned and furthers the progress of each group. But the committee reports would have the American people believe that everyone supports the notion that segregation should be eliminated now. One such committee is the President's Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Forces which reported to the President last year.

At the time the Executive order was issued establishing this committee, Gen. Omar Bradley, who was then Army Chief of Staff, told newsmen in a conference at Fort Knox that he "favored segregation of white and Negro units in the lower level of the Army." When General Bradley was called to testify before the committee he stated:

I would assume that your committee is not only interested in the welfare of our Negro minority but that you are primarily concerned with the need for full utilization of the skills, talents, and competence of all our men in order that the Army might be an efficient and representative protector of our Nation. * * *

Any system of handling manpower and any principles of organization must be based upon what will obtain best results in carrying out our mission, i. e., winning battles in case of war. We must not do anything that will jeopardize national security. * * *

There are several advantages to the Negro soldier in this arrangement. In the first place he is competing with men who have in general had the same opportunities as to education and development of leadership. * * * It is especially necessary that we give every gradient of our population which is transposed from civilian to Army

life, an opportunity to accept responsibility, and learn the basic tenants (sic).

General Bradley continued:

Among the principal disadvantages, complete integration might very seriously affect voluntary enlistments, both Negro and white. Any system of selection within an organization based upon anything but free competition would be contrary to our American system. * * * In addition, such a system might seriously affect morale and thus affect battle efficiency. I consider that a unit has high morale when the men have confidence in themselves, confidence in their fellow-members of their unit, and confidence in their leaders. If we try to force integration on the Army before the country is ready to accept these customs, we may have difficulty attaining high morale along lines I have mentioned.

Major General Dahlquist, on the General Staff of the Army and who is from Minnesota, stated before this same committee that—

So long as we have separate units the competition for noncommissioned officer grades is restricted to that unit. Therefore, the very separation of these people into units has been the thing that has given the Negro far greater opportunity than I think any business or any profession in the United States can point to.

Lt. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem, Jr. was commander of the Third Army and chairman of a board which had prepared a report in 1946 on the subject of utilization of Negro manpower in the postwar Army. Lieutenant General Gillem made a statement before this committee which was a summary of the findings of the Army board relative to composite groups on an unsegregated basis. He states that Negroes would have an adverse obstacle under those conditions, that they would have a better advantage in units composed of their own people.

Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, the Secretary of the Army at that time, stated that:

Another factor to be considered * * * perhaps the most important, is the morale of the troops as a whole—their satisfaction with Army life, and the spirit with which they perform Army tasks. In war, when the chips are down, this morale factor may well be the difference between victory and defeat.

We must remember that soldiers are not mere bodies that can be moved and handled as trucks and guns. They are individuals who came from civilian life and often return thereto. They are subject to all the emotions, prejudices, ideals, ambitions, and inhibitions that encumber our civil population throughout the country. * * * We must remember that in close personal relationships such as exist in an Army unit, that in civilian life voluntary segregation is the normal thing. And this is true even in those localities where no type of segregation is required by law.

Within these statements by top military leaders lies the crux of our proposal. The high morale, efficiency, and spirit of cooperation would materially be furthered if the men placed in the military service under this law would at least have the right to choose the unit with which they would serve.

In conclusion, I wish to say that national defense is too serious a matter to be used by social reformers in any way. They are entitled to their opinion. They have succeeded through the President's Commission in forcing through

nonsegregation. They have behind them the force of the Federal Government. I do not believe it is right to force this upon those boys drafted into military service who do not wish such segregation, and yet my amendment would yield to military necessity—I do not wish to interfere with national defense but I believe it unwise to permit the other side to jeopardize national defense to forward their aims. I trust you will vote against the Price amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we all recognize the fact that these are very serious hours for our Nation and the entire world, but we should all do our very best to keep our feet on the ground and our heads cool. I think we might be able to do that.

I believe we all agree that there is a necessity of extending the draft. I think we are all in full agreement on that. The only disagreement is as to whether the minimum age should be 18½ or 19 years. I definitely favor the 19-year-old limit instead of the 18½-year-old provision.

I am very strongly in favor of the Barden substitute. I want to address myself to just one point in regard to that, because my time is so limited that I cannot go into a number of other arguments I should like to use in favor of the Barden substitute.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], one of the proponents of the bill, in the course of his argument said in substance that basic training may change tomorrow, and he is eminently correct about that. Yes; it may change tomorrow. We are living in a great scientific age, as we all know. Consequently, if basic training may change tomorrow, and it not only may change tomorrow but it all probability it will change tomorrow, how much real good is going to be accomplished by training these men today as Reserves?

The purpose of the universal military-training feature of this bill is to establish a reserve of trained men; but if the basic training changes from day to day and the scientific developments change from day to day, how much real good will be accomplished by it?

We all recognize the fact that we must have a draft in an emergency; and that is the only thing we need, in my judgment. It would be at least somewhat useless and baseless to put this upon us since there could be no real accomplishment. The price we will be paying for UMT will be billions of dollars, over a period of years, and a departure from the traditions of this great Nation. That is the price we will pay. What will we get for that price? That is the question I ask. It seems to me the best reserves in the world we can possibly have are citizens, first, imbued with the principles of Christianity, democracy, and patriotism, second, sound and healthy in mind and body, and third, educated in the normal way. That is the reserve we need and that is the reserve we should always keep. Under our present program and as long as emergencies occur, of course we can take care of those emergencies by a draft. I point that out

to you for your thinking and you can give such consideration to it as you may think it is worth.

Talking about present stirring events, I agree 100 percent with President Truman in the action he took relative to General MacArthur. I believe that the President by such action has very probably prevented an all-out war with Red China, as well as a third world war. For that and other reasons I agree with him 100 percent on that. But I disagree with him as to his right to send troops anywhere he may choose. I think such action is definitely up to the Congress. I will tell you why. In section 8 of article I of the Constitution it is provided that Congress shall have certain powers. One of those powers is to declare war and, if you will note this carefully, Mr. Chairman, in the same section of the same article, is this provision:

Congress shall have power to levy and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense.

Now, how can the Congress provide for the common defense unless it has the right and full power to use the Armed Forces?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] deplored the fact that politicians were attempting to run the war. Most of us agree with him that the politicians should have no part in the question of how the war should be fought. Many of us, however, believe that so-called politicians—some refer to them as statesmen, I refer to them as representatives of the people—should have something to say as to when and where a war is to be fought. Going along with the gentleman from Georgia, I agree that Secretary Acheson should not tell us when a war is to be fought, where it is to be fought, nor how long we are to continue in that war, nor should he name the objectives for which world war III or any war is to be fought. His sympathy for Britain, his concern over her interests, his friendship for and association with known Communists makes him an improper agent to act for America.

Time and again from the well of the House, I have asked someone here to tell me what it is that our men are fighting for, what is it that when they have obtained their objectives, the war will be over, we will have peace and they can come home and live their own lives in the American way.

So far, even though we have had almost 2 weeks of debate on this bill, I have not even a semblance of an answer to that question. I would like to have that answer. The men who are fighting are entitled to an answer, and so are their wives and mothers. Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], the politicians have declared war, they are in control of this war, and they are not even American politicians, they are greedy, power-mad politicians of other countries.

Yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], I wish

someone would notify him, he is out in the hall, and I did not anticipate so early a recognition, made a short but remarkable speech¹ which you may read in foot-

¹ Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] during his remarks said that the people put more confidence in the Congress than in the President.

During the Civil War, reading the current history of those days, there were very few people who had confidence in President Lincoln. I remember history saying that General McClellan challenged the civil government and the President of the United States at that time. I remember history showing that President Lincoln visited the home of General McClellan in Washington. General McClellan was out attending a wedding, and the President and the Secretary of War waited for General McClellan to return to his residence. Some time later General McClellan did return, and his servant told him that President Lincoln and the Secretary of War were waiting to talk to him; and General McClellan went upstairs, passed the room in which Lincoln was seated; that a half hour later President Lincoln asked the servant if General McClellan was going to see him, and the servant told him that General McClellan had retired for the night; that Lincoln then left and went back to the White House.

I remember history telling that very few Members of Congress supported Lincoln in those days. Lincoln was crucified in those days, but Lincoln's Memorial now stands as a shrine, and properly so, to which hundreds of thousands of people make a pilgrimage each year, because Lincoln now is identified as the savior of the Union.

So I think a little reference to history pointedly answers the observation made by my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, in that respect. We see history made today of 435 Americans, each of us elected by the people of our congressional districts, with a direct responsibility imposed upon us in these trying days to do those things as Americans that will be for the best interest of our country, not only today but tomorrow. It is not what we like to do but what we should do. We should face the problems with courage. We should face the issues of the day with confidence and with courage, and we should do those things and cast those votes for issues that will be for the best interests of the United States of America without fear or without regard to personal consequences politically. I have to live with my conscience, and you have to live with yours, and all I can say is that so far as JOHN McCORMACK's conscience is concerned, I am going to vote on the side of strength for my country. For I am satisfied that there is only one thing that the Communists respect, and that is what they fear, and the only thing they fear is a strength and power greater than they possess.

Three years ago I made a speech calling attention to the imperialistic designs of the Soviet Union operating under the ideology of international communism, taking over country after country through internal subversion, the ultimate objective being the United States of America. We can have peace in the world very easily if we want to; there is nothing in the world to stop us from having peace. We do not have to appropriate one penny, and we do not have to take one young man from his home. My two brothers and I left our home in World War I and enlisted as privates. We do not have to make any sacrifices. All we have to do is get down on our knees to Stalin. But what a life afterward? We can live if we want to become slaves, but we have to do those things that our judgment tells us we must do if we want to remain free men and free women.

note 1. Among other statements he said:

I am going to vote on the side of strength for my country, for I am satisfied there is only one thing that the Communists respect and that is what they fear. And the only thing they fear is a strength and power greater than they possess.

Permit me to agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts in his assumption as to the characteristics of the Communists' idea of fear. But what I do not understand, and which I would like to have him explain is how we can contribute to the Communists' fear of strength by giving them Formosa and by refusing to permit the four hundred-odd thousand Nationalist Chinese on Formosa to leave that island and fight the Communists on the mainland. Do we show fear or strength by that policy—which, according to last night's press is to be our policy. Are we not offering appeasement—which the gentleman has so often condemned? The gentleman's talk and the administration's policy which he supports do not seem to be consistent.

Another thing he said, "Three years ago I made a speech calling attention to the imperialistic designs of the Soviet Union operating on the ideology of communism, taking over country after country through internal subversion, the ultimate objective being the United States of America." A little less than 10 months ago Mr. Truman, not General MacArthur, at the request of UN, took us into this war. Then he tied the hands of the general who was directing the war. Last night he told us he wanted to confine that war to Korea. But today he is not only determined to send an additional 200,000 men to Europe. He is demanding that we conscript men who are under 19 years of age, who are denied the right to vote, to fight on foreign soil wherever United Nations may direct. I want none of it.

Again I ask, "How you do reconcile the views the gentleman from Massachusetts expressed against appeasement with the views of the United Nations, under whom we are fighting," when they announce that they are ready to call for peace; ready to give Formosa to Russia? I cannot see the consistency of those two positions.

Another thing the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] said, and I quote: "We can have peace in the world very easily if we want to. There is nothing in the world to stop us from having peace. We do not have to appropriate 1 penny. We do not have to take one young man from his home. All we have to do is to get down on our knees to Stalin. The UN, Great Britain and France now propose just that. What the three are saying is this: 'Quit fighting in Korea so British can keep Hongkong, give Formosa to the Reds, abandon Korea, take the Chinese Communists into the UN where they can by their vote support Russia. A silly futile course which would add strength to Stalin, and send an American Army to Europe in support of Socialist England.

"Get down on our knees to Stalin"—permit a repetition: We went into this war on the orders of President Truman at the request of the Security Council of

the United Nations. That was the President's message. Some 9,000 of our men have died. To what purpose? Today they tell us that the United Nations is about to ask that we sue for peace; surrender to Stalin; let them have Formosa; keep the Nationalist Chinese from fighting the Communists. Take them into UN, get ready for a war in Europe and Northern Africa.

It has been said that this war is fought to contain communism. Do you believe it? Do you believe it when you have the record of our Secretary of State, who is the politician who has been determining our policy and who is sympathetic to the Communist views? Who has, whatever his intention, consistently followed a policy which has helped the Communists, not only in China, but here at home. You cannot have forgotten his friendship for—his help to Hiss.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in view of the established custom, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I make that request, Mr. Chairman, because this is a matter that is near my heart and has been on my mind for many months and because I feel I have a duty to my people. One point I want to enlarge on a little which I tried to express before—the thought that we are fighting to contain communism. We know better. The record of the State Department is to the contrary. Again if we are fighting the Communists would we not clean house here in Washington first. As J. Edgar Hoover said the other day, there are some 210 Communists right here in Washington. Why not start where we can get our hands on them? Why send men across the seas to clean up on the Communists when here in the Nation's capital they smell to high heaven. Let us at least try to be consistent. Those here in the State Department and in the administration when they are not corruptly chasing the dollar have been just playing palsy with the "commies."

They say we are fighting for the free nations. Where is there a free nation in this world, Britain, France, and the Netherlands still have their colonies, their exploited peoples. Even here in America are we free? We are being told, and more and more we will be told as the days go on, that we cannot buy this or we cannot buy that. We come under more and more regimentation all the time and that by incompetent or corrupt administrators. And what is the purpose of this bill?

The bill now pending before the House calls for the conscription into the armed services of the United States for a period of 26 months of every physically and mentally fit young American man—except those not otherwise deferred—as he reaches the age of 18 years and 6 months.

Another purpose of the bill is to require those so conscripted to remain in either

the active or reserve service for an overall period of 6 years. After the expiration of the first 26 months in active service, either as trainees or combat troops, the surviving conscripted men would be returned to their homes, subject, however, to recall to active service, not as individuals but with their organizational units.

The testimony of Anna Rosenberg and General Marshall before the Armed Services Committee of the House in support of their original plan indicated their purpose was to draft the youth of America for a period of 26 months and to retain them, either in the active or reserve service, for an additional period of 6 years, or an over-all period of 8 years. The House Armed Services Committee refused to accept that program. The present bill is far less drastic.

The present bill rests upon the assumption, first, that war is inevitable and, second, that the welfare of our people, the security of the Republic, is dependent upon our entry into some form of a "one world" organization in which practically all economically powerful nations would be members.

Such an organization, known as United Nations, the announced desirable purpose of which is to establish and maintain peace throughout the world, and in which 59 nations are members, is now in existence.

The difficulty of either establishing or maintaining universal peace through the activities of United Nations is apparent when we realize that the United States of America and several other nations—in a very minor way—are now fighting a war, the purpose of which we have said is to contain communism, preserve free nations, and that in that war in the Far East, the Communists, led by Russia, are our opponents while they still sit in the United Nations.

The war in Korea is being fought under the flag and command of United Nations and in that organization sit the representatives of the United States and the representatives of Russia.

On the battlefields of Korea 90 percent of the fighting is by American forces—90 percent of the casualties are American men. One hundred percent of the men opposed to our forces are Communists, inspired to fight by Russia.

The real purpose of this bill is to conscript the young men of America; for the first time in the history of our country, for the first time in the history of any nation since the days of the feudal lords, men are being conscripted to fight for other nations—as mercenary soldiers—under the Stars and Stripes? Oh, no. Under the flag of an organization made up of individuals who are not Americans. Sometimes seeing, one can make himself understood. But first, what is this flag? It is the stars—48 of them—and the stripes—13 of them—the Star-Spangled Banner it has been named—and the pledge:

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

And what are we doing? Surrendering our allegiance to that flag. Conscripting

men to fight, not under the Stars and Stripes? But under a "rag"—the banner of as quarrelsome and impotent a group as a roof ever sheltered.

Let me show you another "rag" that I picked up in 1942, that they tried to get us into war under. The flag of the one-worlders, the United States of the World, the Federated Union Streit; Owen J. Roberts, Ickes, and how many more with high ideals but not too much good sense.

See this flag. Stars? Yes. Stripes? Yes, but superimposed the symbol of Britain and of Russia. One world; that was Davis' so-called organization. In it we would have lost our sovereignty.

What is the one under which today your men are fighting? Here is the rag; this spider web on a field of pale blue and these men that you conscript, they sail from America's shores under the Stars and Stripes, but when they get on the high seas and when they land abroad in Asia or in Europe they fight not under the Stars and Stripes, oh, no, but under the flag of the United Nations, which flies over the CO post—over the combat forces in the place of the Stars and Stripes.

Now, I ask you, how can you conscript, how can you vote to conscript the young men of America to fight under another flag, under another commander, not an American, under one who takes his orders not from the Congress, not from the President; but from an organization on which sits at least one, perhaps six, of our enemies, one a representative of Red Russia? Some of the others at all times willing to sacrifice our interests, the lives of our men if their interests be served.

The Marshall plan distributed our dollars all over the world. Be that good or bad, that is something that we cannot now change, though to our sorrow we know it has made, is continuing to make Russia, Stalin and the Communists powerful, better able to fight us. This conscription plan is another Marshall plan. It distributes all over the world at the direction of UN not dollars, not dollars, but your own flesh and blood. The youth of America to aid a socialist England, to protect and advance the commercial interests of Britain, to assist a France more than a third Communist, to help those and some other nations exploit, gain profit from people they hold by force of arms. To what end? And for what purpose? Oh, you remember the boast of the British Empire, do you not? Even though you may have forgotten the myth that only the British Navy protected us from destruction, remember that boast, that the sun never sets on the British flag? Now, if we as a nation keep on in the course upon which we are embarked, soon Stalin and the British can boast that the sun never goes down on the cross which marks the grave of an American soldier. That the morning sun as it comes up over the horizon never fails to cast the shadow of a cross on the grave of some mother's boy who gave his life, not for home or country, but in a futile war waged to advance the fortune of some ambitious power-mad politician.

Follow the course now charted for us by an Acheson and his crew, and Stalin, trapping us into exhausting our resources, wasting and dispersing our strength all over the world, will have won—will have destroyed the Republic.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the Price amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 25 minutes.

Mr. POTTER. I object.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will withhold his request for a while.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate my colleague and friend from Mississippi on the calm manner in which he approached this problem. I hope that everyone who speaks here today will bear in mind that that is really the only way to discuss this question. I believe that the purpose of the Members of this House, regardless of what their views may be, is that we should now present a united front against the common enemy and that anything or any method by which we can promote harmony and good will among all of the members of the Armed Forces is the thing that we all desire to do.

As the gentleman from Mississippi stated, the purpose of the provisions of this bill is to do that, and it is to leave to the military authorities themselves the question of handling this proposition without having to yield to the recommendations or the views of anyone or any committee.

Now, there is not any question but what this problem has been met over a long period of years by the military without any recommendations from any committee or anyone else satisfactorily and if they are left alone they will continue to do that. Long after this committee that the gentleman from Mississippi had reference to was appointed back in 1948, long after they had met with and discussed the problem with all of the armed services and made informal recommendations and before they made their final recommendation, the armed services were slow in yielding ground as to what they should do, and while they have yielded, if they are permitted to run the thing according to the way they think it should be run, and that is what this provision will say to them, I believe we will have a more united front than we will have in any other way.

Secretary Gray while he was Secretary of the Army testified before our committee last January and at that time the gentleman from Mississippi who has just spoken asked this question with reference to the provision which at that

time was being considered in the draft bill:

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Secretary, would you have any objections to providing in this bill that each individual when he registers shall have the right to express himself on three questions: Do you prefer to serve in a segregated unit, or do you prefer not to serve in an integrated unit, or do you have any choice? It would give us a chance to let the individuals speak instead of the politicians and the Secretary of Defense.

Secretary GRAY. Mr. WINSTEAD, I wouldn't have an objection to an individual expressing himself. If that is what you mean, as you stated it, I would have no objection to their expressing themselves. I don't know that we could agree that that would be binding.

We do not provide that it is binding. We provide in there that it shall be done as far as military necessity will permit, which gives them a broad latitude as to whether they consider it practical or not to the best interests of the armed services. Later on and while Secretary Gray was before the committee, I asked him about the present policy in the Army. This was still in January 1950.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, he stated in reply to my question, and I am still referring to Secretary Gray:

Secretary GRAY. There is no policy of elimination of segregation in the Army at the present time. In order to answer your question, let me tell you what this recent directive amounted to that we sent out to the field, which was published in the press recently. It is provided that in a critical band of specialties which are published periodically by the Army, that is specialties where we do not have people available to fill them—there are some 35 or 40—in this critical band of specialties if there is a Negro specialist who meets the qualifications, and who is available, and if there is a vacancy in the Army command, they must assign him to a unit regardless of race or color. That is in a group of clearly defined areas of activity; radar operators, for example, various kinds of mechanics and other specialties.

In addition, major commanders are now given the power to assign Negroes with special skills and qualifications to units in MOS's or military occupation specialties, other than the critical list which we publish here in the Department at Washington. But as the press has indicated, this policy does not contemplate the elimination of the Negro units in being. It does not mean integration at this time in the Army. My own frank opinion is that some day in the future we will come to integration. I think that day is some time in the future.

A fair conclusion from what the Secretary says there is that he thinks the Army should travel along with the country. He does not think the country is yet ready for that policy to be adopted. Since he made the statement, of course, when we talked with him about it, they are following policies that do involve segregation in the Army, but I am concerned that they have just about done

away with their former policy, and I fear that it is due to the pressure that has been brought to bear upon them from time to time by pressure groups and by this committee that was appointed, and in deference to some Executive order which was issued, rather than carrying out their own good judgment.

It was said here a moment ago that we have not had any incidents up to this time which indicated that nonsegregation was unwise.

There was an incident down in Camp Rucker in the month of March of this year. I am reading from the Dothan Eagle of Friday afternoon, March 9, 1951. It states as follows:

Soldiers from "all over" in Rucker row PIO says.

Camp Rucker Public Information Office said today that soldiers from practically all sections of the United States were involved in a fight between Negroes and whites at a post exchange earlier this week.

At the same time the PIO announced that the Army Inspector General, Maj. Gen. Louis A. Craig, had arrived at the post but his visit has no bearing on the incident.

It goes on to say:

Home States specifically mentioned in the PIO statement were Georgia, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan, but a spokesman said if a complete check was made, it probably would reveal that soldiers from practically every State in the Nation were involved.

Six men were injured in the affray, which Rucker officials said started with an argument over the use of a juke box in the post exchange.

Military police broke up the fight in short order, reportedly using tear gas to rout the rioters. Unofficial military sources in Dothan said approximately 60 men were involved in the fight, which left the exchange nearly wrecked.

Well, that was an unfortunate incident that occurred, and we may have further unfortunate incidents of that kind. What we want now in this country is an opportunity to present a united and harmonious front to fight the enemy in Korea or elsewhere should the necessity arise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. It is on that point that I wanted to bring out the significance of this particular provision. Actually the provision as written goes only to registration in the future and it does not affect segregation in the Army or the Armed Forces as it now exist. So, if this amendment is adopted, how can you say you will have unity when you will have the new registrants segregated on their original registration, while you have

3,500,000 men now in the service in unsegregated units?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. According to the Army, they are not now altogether in unsegregated units, from what they tell me. What we do in this amendment is to leave that problem for the military to work out in the best method that they can.

In reply to another question that the gentleman asked the gentleman from Mississippi about whether a general could express his preference or not, as I understand the provision in this bill it only applies to inductees under the draft, and there would not be any officers inducted under the draft.

Mr. FULTON. Yes, but does it not nevertheless follow them all through their service on any military assignment, so if any of these boys got up to be a captain or a colonel or a general he then would have this segregation right following him?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. It says he has the right to express himself at the time of induction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield, I should like to ask the gentleman as a member of the committee two questions as to how this provision will operate: On the basis of the gentleman's statement concerning what happened at Camp Rucker, would the gentleman then not argue in accordance with what I believe his thesis to be that no colored troops of any type, whether from the Northern States or not, should be sent into the South, whether they are in segregated units or not, because of the possibility of such incidents occurring?

The second question I should like to ask is, what happens under the provision for which the gentleman is speaking in the event there is a particular technician that is needed by a segregated group? I am thinking of such scientists as George Washington Carver and Dr. Percy Julian, who have peculiar skills and knowledges. Suppose there were a Negro who had skills which were needed in a segregated unit; what would happen under those circumstances?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. The gentleman has two questions combined there, but in answer to the first question I will say that from what I have read you, this report, it was merely incidental that this matter occurred in the South because the ones involved were, according to the report, from practically every State in the Union. I think we have to look at this thing as a country-at-large proposition.

In regard to the gentleman's second question, as far as the specialties are concerned, I do not believe this would interfere with that at all. I think it would leave it in the discretion of the

military to exercise their judgment in regard to it.

Mr. YATES. But would not individual soldiers have the right in declaring for segregation to refuse to serve with such a specialist?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I do not believe they would.

Mr. YATES. They would not have the right?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I do not believe they would. I believe they have a right to express themselves, but then I believe the military under this provision is given the right to exercise their judgment as to whether that expression should be granted. They will grant it unless military necessity would prevent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Am I right that the Winstead amendment provides for segregation where in the judgment of the Army it is practicable? If that is stricken out, would it not follow that under the present operation the Army would be forced to have nonsegregation under the Presidential directive and under the recommendations of this committee even though nonsegregation be impracticable.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. That is my interpretation of it. There might be various interpretations. Some Members might say that military necessity does not mean the same as practicable, but I think that is the construction the military authorities would put on the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Under the Winstead provision the determination of when it is permitted and when it is not lies with the military?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Correct.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. In answer to the question posed a moment ago by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], is it not true that when you are drafted or when you enlist in the service, that is, when you are an enlisted man, before you are an officer, you are discharged at the convenience of the Government, before you can accept a commission?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia that I cannot answer that question. I expect the gentleman from Georgia is really better informed about that than I am. May I ask the committee chairman about that?

Mr. VINSON. The statement of the gentleman from Georgia is correct.

Mr. FULTON. May we have the question answered by the chairman?

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman address his remarks to the gentleman from Alabama? I will take the floor in my time.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask the chairman of the committee a question?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. As I understood the chairman, he said he preferred not to answer questions on my time, and therefore I must decline to yield.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity of first congratulating the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Mississippi for the very high level on which they have pitched their remarks. It is very encouraging in this body after these many years to find that at last we can speak about subjects which we view with a great deal of passion with the dignity befitting the House of Representatives of this Nation. Light rather than heat will always provide more guidance.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak, although I did address the House last week for some time on this subject, because this amendment of my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] was originally mine. I so informed the Members of the House by mail during the early part of this week that I would offer it. However, after consultation, I thought it would be better if a member of the Committee on Armed Services offered it.

I would like to just state a few facts so that we can see the entire picture correctly. In the first place this provision authored by the gentleman from Mississippi was never in the original bill. It was not in the original bill which was sent from the Pentagon. It was not in the original bill which was rewritten by our eminent chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and his colleagues. It was not in the original Senate bill and it is not in the Senate bill as now passed by that body. This, then, is an amendment which was adopted by a vote of the committee—not a unanimous vote, but a closely divided vote, and I think the House should know, by a vote which would not have been possible if a great many people from the Republican side of the aisle had not voted with those on this side. I want you to know there have been certain statements made which are not correct. I do not impugn the motives of those who have made the statement, nor their desire for accuracy, but I do want to present you with the real facts.

In the first place, we have not fought wars on the basis of total segregation as has been stated. The United States Navy was not segregated until recent years. We never had an Air Force until recently. That Air Force has developed into our finest striking arm. Today our Air Force is unsegregated and our Navy is unsegregated. But truth of the matter is that there is still segregation in the Army. As the Secretary of the Army said a year and a half ago, some day integration would come, and they would work toward it. They are work-

ing toward it now, and I hope the chairman of our Committee on Armed Services will tell you that progress has been made. But nevertheless, there is still segregation in the Army. Therefore, you cannot prove that integration is not good by citing instances which are happening now in a segregated army. This the gentleman from Alabama tried to do. I would like you to know that morale in Korea has greatly increased where there is no segregation. In all of Korea, only two whites have been sentenced for violating the seventy-fifth article of war. In all of Korea not a single Negro has been sentenced for violating the seventy-fifth article of war, except in the one segregated regiment now left in our whole Armed Forces, the Twenty-fifth, and in that one regiment 32 men were sentenced for violating the seventy-fifth article of war.

I would like for you to know how integration works even further. In all of the 4 years of World War II, with hundreds of thousands of Negro troops, only four Distinguished Service Crosses were won by Negroes. In 6 months in Korea, with comparatively a handful of Negro troops, nine Distinguished Service Crosses were won, and they were won by Negroes fighting in nonsegregated units.

I would like to go further and say that the Winstead clause is impractical. Leaving aside the racial question it cannot be operated. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has pointed that out. Under the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi, you will draft men and then give them the power to select where they want to serve. That is not a draft.

The language of the Winstead amendment is very ambiguous. It does not point out where the draftee can serve. It says he can select whatever "unit" he wants. What does unit mean—a platoon? Does it mean a battalion; does it mean a regiment; does it mean an Army corps, does it mean a cruiser, does it mean a destroyer, does it mean a submarine? What does it mean—"unit"? This is impractical and cannot be operated.

Maybe a year and a half ago the Secretary of War was not in favor of integration then, but I defy any member of the Armed Services Committee to tell me a single person of importance in the Pentagon, on the Joint Staff, who has told them that they are in favor of the Winstead amendment. I await your reply now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. I ask you on the Armed Services Committee to inform this House of a single top-ranking member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from the Pentagon, who is in favor of the

Winstead amendment in this day of our Lord, April 12, 1951. The truth is—and if I am wrong correct me—the Pentagon does not want this amendment. If I am wrong, I stand to be corrected and I now await your reply.

It has been stated that Negro people want segregation. No, Mr. Chairman, that is not true by any stretch of the imagination. For the past 4 days this Hill has had representatives from every State in the Union, including the States of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED], coming to see you, my colleagues in your offices, telling you that they are not in favor of the Winstead amendment. There is not a single Negro organization in this country that is in favor of segregation. Oh, of course you can pick out individuals here and there, there have always been such in all the pages of history, that would be in favor of anything; but I mean sensible, forward-looking people. They are not in favor of segregation. By the power of the living God we are going to purge it from the American scene.

Finally, perhaps we have fought some wars in the past on the basis of a segregated army. This is not a war of the past. This is a new war. This is a war of freedom. This is an earth-shaking war. This is not a war to protect our country. This is a war to carry the torch of freedom to portions of the earth where freedom has never been known, to portions of the world that are now enslaved. You cannot do this with men shackled by the chains of segregation. If we are to appeal to this world that we are the torch bearers of this new liberty of mankind, that we are the vanguard of those who are going to make this not just "the land of the free and the home of the brave" but a world of the free and a world of the brave, how can we do it by saying, "We have black men here, white men there, yellow men over there, separated, divided, with no equality"? You are asking on a world basis 1,000,000,000 colored people to be the allies of a nation that practices the color bar. This will be the end of our Nation. It will give Communists almost certain victory.

I know the problems of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED]. But look beyond these narrow problems. Look at the whole picture of our Nation, 48 States of many, many races, going forth to do battle as a modern Sir Galahad: "One nation, indivisible." Let us not go forth half slave and half free. Let us not go forth half integrated and half segregated. If we do we will lose.

I ask you to support this amendment that our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] has offered, and put this draft bill back in the form in which it was originally, back in the form in which it is now in the Senate.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am glad to hear the gentleman say what he did

about the spirit in which our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] has offered his amendment. I would like to say something that I am sure will be endorsed by many who differ with the gentleman from New York as to the amendment, and that is that he himself has added to the good will and tolerance which characterizes the debate. The gentleman from New York earlier in the year helped to clear the atmosphere and thus advanced the spirit of unity when it was desperately needed.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question, however: If he is not willing to concede, in case his view prevails and the Winstead amendment goes out, that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] has raised some pertinent points and that the armed services would not have a mandate by that negative action to create an integrated army overnight; that it would not mean disregarding individual attitudes of inductees? If the gentleman gets my point, is he willing to agree that no such mandate would exist?

Mr. POWELL. I am not sure that I know just what the gentleman means.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I mean, here is a young inductee who is not accustomed to the kind of integrated army for which the gentleman pleads—and I am not quarreling with him about that—should not the inductee's wishes, under proper circumstances, at least, be regarded and respected and an effort be made by the armed services to consider individual desires while evolving policies that achieve the goals favored by the gentleman from New York?

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman has raised a point; but when are you going to make a start toward progress? That is the question I asked you. Secondly, when a man is drafted, his wishes are left home. If you give him a choice, you defeat the draft.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding. May I add, Mr. Chairman, that in the final analysis it is the responsibility of the armed services to work out a proper policy on this point. I have projected this idea into the discussion only because I believe whatever happens to the amendment, weight should be given to the individual attitudes of inductees. And that applies with equal force to those preferring nonsegregated units as well as others.

It is a serious matter under any conditions to take men from their normal ways into military life. Since many are not conditioned by training and backgrounds for all of the innovations mentioned here, I see no justification for holding that defeat of the Winstead amendment would carry implications that the armed services must be indifferent to individual backgrounds.

I recognize the basis for the gentleman's opposition to segregation and I am sure he understands that I would not seek, even by indirection, to extend my own region's social patterns by Federal law.

I am arguing only that we stick to the idea of gradually working out a desirable

relationship for the races as they serve in uniform. An Executive order that pursues the goal of nonsegregation too rigidly will not only damage morale, it will tend to defeat its own purposes.

The case cited by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] is an illustration. No matter how one feels about segregated college groups, the armed services worked an injustice in forbidding training units on such campuses. Incidentally, many colleges in the South have already begun to alter segregation policies and real progress is being made.

My own views on this difficult question have been previously stated to the House. I believe that these comments are consistent with them.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can reach some agreement as to a limit on debate on the Price amendment? Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Price amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, and that the committee shall have the last 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Price amendment and all amendments thereto close within 30 minutes, and that the committee have the last 5.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point against the motion on the ground that it is out of order.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the last statement reserving 5 minutes to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves that all debate on the Price amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YORTY. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has made a learned, dispassionate and compelling statement, which makes any remarks I might make at this point seem unnecessary and superfluous. I want to join with my other colleagues who have complimented the gentleman by adding my compliments to theirs. This is the type of question that is apt to arouse our emotions, and it is well that it is being debated calmly because, as I view the problem, cold logic as well as justice is on the side of those supporting the amendment by Mr. PRICE, which would delete from the bill the Winstead amendment designed to compel the creation of segregated units in our Armed Forces.

Segregation at this time would be a backward step, and would wipe out the admirable progress that has been made toward integration of our Armed Forces. When it comes to the defense of our country, how can even the most preju-

diced person contend that there should be a distinction between Americans based upon race. To me, such a distinction is contrary to the religious faith which we profess, and contrary to the law of inherent, fundamental human rights.

At this time, when our Nation is attempting to lead the free men of all colors, races, and creeds in the defense of the great ideals of human liberty and justice, it seems particularly inopportune that we should, in the Halls of this great Congress where all Americans are represented, allow ourselves to be misled into compelling, by our acts, the continuance of discrimination between our citizens.

I fully realize that some of the men from some sections of the country will need to adjust themselves, and to ameliorate their attitudes, in order to make the program of integration effective, but their doing so will be in the interest of national welfare, and I am sure that our patriotic young men will not hesitate to wholeheartedly respond to the national and international need for an end to discrimination based upon race, creed, or color. America cannot hold high the torch of human liberty with a firm hand, unless it is willing to practice what it preaches.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, in January of 1949 and January of 1951, I introduced bills to prohibit race segregation in the Armed Forces of the United States. In my opinion, such segregation is a shameful and flagrant violation of the very principles of democracy which our men are now being called upon to defend. It must be ended if we are to convince the enemies of democracy that we are sincere in our proclamation that "all men are created equal" and that in this Nation, there shall be "liberty and justice for all."

According to reports, race segregation has been eliminated in the Navy and Air Force. As a result, morale has been raised, and the services have been strengthened—not weakened. The Army has been making strides in the right direction. The Winstead amendment which has been proposed would be a terrible blow—first to the brave men discriminated against, and second to the right-thinking citizens who prefer that we practice what we preach. It would undo all the efforts which have been put forth to remove this blot of discrimination, and the results accomplished thus far. It would make our servicemen wonder if the cause they are dying for is indeed a worthy one. Certainly, it would give great comfort to our enemies, as well as ammunition in their propaganda against us.

Death-dealing missiles reach all men indiscriminately and all suffer the same mortal pain, regardless of their color. In drafting our youth, they should be

made to feel that they are fighting for a just cause; that this means that the defenders of our beloved country must be willing to fight side by side to preserve the liberty of all. How utterly stupid it would be for us to inject feelings of racial hatreds into our Armed Forces, when it is so important to maintain high standards of morale and a feeling of responsibility toward one another, among our servicemen. These make for efficient and victorious soldiers—racial discrimination causes ill feelings and disintegration.

For these reasons, the Winstead amendment must be defeated. We cannot afford to tolerate, much less foster, discrimination in our Armed Forces. Every effort should be made to wipe it out. Our servicemen must have the example of sincerity on our part if they are to be called upon to sacrifice their lives so that democracy may survive. Victory and survival depend upon the concerted efforts and cooperation of all. To discriminate against any segment of our population in these perilous days, either at home or on the battlefield, is to court disaster.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Chairman, I join my friend from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] in opposition to the Winstead amendment to this bill and shall wholeheartedly support the amendment that has been offered by him.

The proposal to allow any registrant to demand to serve in a segregated unit is unfair and unwise from every standpoint. Segregation and discrimination are difficult to wipe out, in the Army as elsewhere, but the task of eliminating them has progressed so far that we must be on guard against attempts to back-track. The Army has moved cautiously in carrying out the integration program, but considerable progress has been made since the President's policy statement in January, ordering equality of treatment. To turn back the clock by enforcing harsh and wasteful segregation and discrimination would undermine the training of servicemen and reduce the efficiency of the fighting forces. How can anyone be asked to fight to preserve democracy when the very Nation he is asked to fight for discriminates so shamefully? Our country is committed to the defense of the basic American principles of liberty, justice, and equality. Yet, the supporters of the Winstead amendment believe that those who consider themselves too good to serve, fight, and die alongside of members of other races should be privileged to demand an organization of units segregated as to race. It is a contradiction of the democratic principle of selective service whereby all young men, regardless of their circumstances, are called upon to defend their country.

Aside from the blow to our ideals that the Winstead amendment proposes,

those who put their prejudices above the best interests of our country are playing Stalin's game, whether they know it or not. This is the most effective way to provide grist for the Russian propaganda mill, and to weaken our position of leadership among the nations representing all races of mankind.

The Winstead amendment would dangerously cripple the objective of this legislation which is to strengthen our Armed Forces and thereby add to our national security. I earnestly hope that the House will reject the Winstead amendment and will adopt the Price amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I think it has been made clear that the Winstead proposal is already in the bill, that if Members vote for the Price amendment they get it out of the bill. This Price amendment would strike the Winstead proposal out of the bill.

I think it is a fair statement to say that the burden of the argument of the proponents of segregation in the armed services has always been to leave it to the armed services themselves and they would work it out. Well, the armed services have made their decision, the question is whether it is being carried out. There is no segregation in the Navy; there is no segregation in the Air Force. The Secretary of Defense has ordered it to be eliminated. They have everything they wanted. The Armed Forces are handling it and the Armed Forces say segregation should go.

Finally, I want to say that the gentleman from New Jersey and I inspected the situation at Fort Dix. Segregation was ordered out there in February of this year among the units on that post. Segregation had existed there among the units in training and it was ordered replaced by integration. We found the morale of the Negro troops, as a result, had risen about 100 percent. We found that the integrated units were going forward in training just as fast as ever. We found very importantly, too, and the commanding officer said that integration enabled them to use facilities to the full which theretofore had remained completely idle, facilities for training, barracks, and messing because there were not enough Negro troops in training on the post often to occupy them as they were segregated facilities.

If we want unity, if we are going to do the job that has got to be done to defend freedom in our Nation and the world, you cannot make second-class citizens out of some Americans and differentiate one American because of color or because he is from some other minority from another. This provision sought to be stricken from the bill establishes enforced segregation in the armed services—among men and women sworn together to serve their country even unto life itself—and I think this provision ought to come out of this bill if we mean what we say about unity.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRIEST). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Price amendment. The bill which we are debating, in proposing to create for the first time in the history of our country a system of universal military training, will inevitably bring with it, if it is adopted, the most profound changes in the social structure of this country. Life with the military must necessarily become an inherent part of our society for many, many years to come. We must give recognition to the fact that many changes in our mores and customs will occur, for it is a new way of life—a new part in our democratic processes which we are creating.

That is why I oppose the Winstead provision of the bill. It attempts to freeze our social structure as it exists today, rather than seizing this opportunity to take advantage of the possibility of eliminating some of our current social abuses. I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Mississippi for the very objective and dispassionate manner in which they pleaded their side of what is necessarily a subject which arouses extreme emotion and passion. They are both able and conscientious legislators, and while they have presented their argument with all the force at their command, it seems to me that their viewpoint is unrealistic and would place the dying and, in many instances, the dead hand of the past upon the stormy present and the dynamic future. They propose to impose and crystallize upon and into the military service a decadent caste system which would seriously cripple, if not destroy, every social advance that has been made for better understanding between the peoples of various races.

They argue that we cannot change our present social standards—that for the sake of unity we must maintain the status quo. Why must we maintain a status quo which even they recognize is bad, and for which they plead for time's remedy as a cure? I think the best answer to their argument is given in the parable of the discussion between Glaucon and Socrates wherein Glaucon said to Socrates:

Socrates, I do not believe that there is such a city of God anywhere on earth.

Socrates replied:

Whether such a city exists in heaven or ever will exist on earth, the wise man will live after the manner of that city, having nothing to do with any other, and in so looking upon it, will set his own house in order.

I believe their argument that Negroes prefer the present system is equally untenable. Let me cite to them the statement of one Negro, a man who, like Dr. George Washington Carver, broke through the almost insuperable obstacles which today throttle members of his race to reach the pinnacle of scientific achievement. I refer to Dr. Percy L. Julian of my home city of Chicago, who is world famous as the discoverer of numerous life-giving drugs, such as cortisone, the hormone compound which is used in the treatment of arthritis;

physostigmine, used in the cure of the eye disease, glaucoma; prostigmine, used in the treatment of paralysis, and synthetic male and female hormones credited with saving the lives of countless unborn babies by protecting expectant mothers from miscarriage. Dr. Julian has discovered too, aero-foam, the fire extinguisher which saved so many lives aboard our ships during the last war.

In his speech before the Decalogue Society of Lawyers in Chicago on March 3, 1951, when he received the annual award for merit bestowed by the Decalogue Society of Lawyers to an outstanding person in the community, Dr. Julian said:

I would be faithless to my strongest convictions as an American citizen did I not tell you that the image of our national character is severely blurred for the rest of the civilized world by the miserable eighteenth and nineteenth-century Europeanlike ghettos which choke the honor and human decency out of nearly every major metropolis in this Nation. It is symptomatic of our smugness that we expect to weld Americans together in a unity of purpose, while we subject the spirits of 15,000,000 of Americans to the horrors of a Dachau and Buchenwald psychology. We cannot hold the garment of God in our right hand and raise it to our lips while a left hand behind our back is clasped firmly in the grip of Satan, and expect a world of people to discern a coveted image of our national character. I warn my fellow citizens that no true patriotism can emanate from the American ghettos. It has only served to create a house bitterly divided against itself, and though the house may stand, its strength and fiber are violated. Someday, someone will write a dramatic story for the rest of the civilized world of the detailed horrors of the American ghetto and the peculiar helplessness of its innocent victims. I say unto you now that the forces which have fought to maintain American Negro ghettos must be destroyed.

* * * We certainly cannot weld together a Nation of one people by reminding 15,000,000 Americans constantly of white neighborhoods any more than by asking them to die for a white country.

Dr. Julian's statement is particularly appropriate in its application to the Winstead provision, for that part of the bill is specifically intended to create within the Military Establishment Negro compounds or isolation wards, if you prefer, exactly like those in which Negroes are compelled to live in cities today. The Army is not a social fraternity; it is not a tea party; it is not an Army of a few States of this Nation, but of the United States of America. The customs of a civil society which restrict and relegate to American citizens inferior citizenship has no place in a military system. The blood of Negro Americans which may be shed upon the battlefield should be as precious and dear to our thinking as that of all other classes of American citizens.

What about the members of other races? The Winstead provision may very well affect them as well. Members of the House from Texas will remember, I am sure, the honorary citizenship bestowed by their great State upon the Nissei Japanese of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team who rescued the lost battalion of Texas in

Italy at a cost in lives to themselves greater than the number of men whom they rescued. Can you say now that the boys entering service from Texas or any other part of the country should be given the privilege of not serving with American-born Japanese, as the Winstead provision proposes?

Much progress in civil life is being made in connection with interracial problems. For example, the Christian Science Monitor for Friday, April 6, states that—

A Negro youth growing up in Chicago today can see doors of employment opportunity opening to him which not long ago were closed tight to members of his race.

Conservative business is largely responsible. Executives of corporations and their staffs are working at this business of breaking down old habits based on race prejudice, and are succeeding. Persons in service organizations say that the openings, although still few numerically, are of significance far out of proportion to their numbers.

This makes sense. This shows that at long last we are moving in the right direction and I think it important to point out that with respect to the progress being made in Chicago, as cited in the article, the steps that are being taken toward better racial understanding, are being pushed by some of the most conservative business firms in the city, such as the International Harvester Co., the Illinois Bell Telephone Co., and Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co.

Our Military Establishment has been making progress, too, with its interracial problems. The Air Force is well advanced and has a very high morale under a policy of integration. The Navy has taken great strides, too, and the Army is moving in the same direction, slowly but surely. Directly contrary to what the gentlemen from Mississippi and Alabama have said that the Winstead proposal gives the Army a free hand to deal with the problem, its effect will be to tie the hands of the military and prevent their dealing with interracial groups upon a realistic and sympathetic basis.

I strongly urge the Members of the House to vote the Price amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Price amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, when we go back into the House I am going to ask permission to insert in the RECORD some material which I have here.

Here is a news item:

Twenty-four men in Korea win awards for gallantry from 15 different States.

They are all Negroes. I also have here a list of Negroes who have been given the Distinguished Service Cross for gallantry

in action. I want to read just one little line from a citation:

Headless of his personal safety, he shielded the two wounded men with his own body in an effort to protect them from further wounds. While in this exposed position he was mortally wounded.

Corp. Levi Jackson, Jr., of Pennsylvania, gave his life for two men who were wounded. He was a medical corpsman in Korea.

We talk about democracy in this country, we talk about it throughout the world. I am told that people from 124 different nationalities and races are in our armed services. We have got to prove to the people throughout the world that we believe in the thing that we preach, because we are going to have to depend upon the people of all races to fight this fight of freedom. We cannot depend on only the white race, there are too few of us; we are going to have to admit sooner or later that we are going to have to have help from the colored races throughout the world.

I beg of you to support the Price amendment to strike this particular principle from the bill. You will be doing a thing that is honorable, you will be making your contribution today for the real forces of democracy.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I shall get permission in the House to insert five citations to Negroes of our highest military award for bravery in action, the Distinguished Service Cross:

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS AWARDS

Second Lt. William M. Benefield, Jr., (posthumous), Corps of Engineers, United States Army, a member of the Seventy-seventh Engineer Combat Company, Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment, Twenty-fifth Infantry Division, distinguished himself by extraordinary heroism in connection with military operations against an armed enemy on July 29, 1950, near Sangju, Korea. On July 29, 1950, during daylight hours, the Seventy-seventh Engineer Combat Company received orders to advance against the enemy's position. Information was received on the location of an enemy mine field in the path of the company's advance. Realizing the danger to personnel of the company, Lieutenant Benefield with complete disregard for his personnel safety, went forward alone. Although the area was swept by intense small-arms fire, he advanced to within 200 yards of the enemy position and attempted to remove the mine field. During this action Lieutenant Benefield was killed. The extraordinary heroism displayed by Lieutenant Benefield reflects the highest credit on himself and the military service.

Master Sgt. Curtis D. Pugh, Infantry, United States Army. Sergeant Pugh, a member of Company L, Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment, Twenty-fifth Infantry Division, distinguished himself by extraordinary heroism in action against a numerically superior enemy near Haman, Korea, on September 15, 1950. Sergeant Pugh, as a volunteer member of a rear guard, held his position on a narrow mountain ridge and fought off a series of fanatical enemy assaults at ranges as close as 10 yards. He personally stopped one attack by rising from behind his rock barricade with utter disregard for his own safety and firing his automatic rifle in an arc before him. When his battalion commander was engaged in a hand to hand combat with enemy soldiers, Sergeant Pugh came to his rescue and saved

the life of the battalion commander by shooting the enemy soldiers who had succeeded in wounding him. Sergeant Pugh then maintained a base of fire until the wounded officer was able to escape. The extraordinary heroism displayed by Sergeant Pugh reflects great credit on himself and is in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service. Entered the military service from Georgia.

Sgt. First Class Arthur C. Dudley, Infantry, United States Army, a member of Company B, Nineteenth Infantry Regiment, Twenty-fourth Infantry Division distinguished himself by extraordinary heroism against an armed enemy near Ch'angnyong, Korea, during the period August 2 to 7, 1950. Sergeant Dudley's company which was occupying a defensive position near the Naktong River, had suffered severe casualties and was at half strength from the result of continuous fighting over a period of weeks. Men were exhausted and were subjected to harassing fire particularly from snipers and automatic weapons. Sergeant Dudley, an expert rifleman, continually exposed himself by moving from one position to another, in order to locate and fire on the enemy and his unerring accuracy with the M1 rifle, often at unbelievable ranges, soon became the pride of his organization. Although often observed and fired upon by both automatic weapons and snipers, Sergeant Dudley calmly continued to expose himself and during a period of approximately 5 days, destroyed over 50 enemy riflemen and machinegunners. On August 7, 1950, Sergeant Dudley left his fox hole under fire, in order to clear a jammed machinegun, which was proving difficult for the gunner. Later that day he was wounded, but before being evacuated expressed concern that he be permitted to return as soon as possible, in order to continue his deadly destruction of the enemy. The extraordinary heroism displayed by Sergeant Dudley on this occasion reflects the highest credit on himself and the military service. Entered the military service from Florida.

Sergeant Dudley won his DSC while assigned to the Nineteenth Infantry Regiment, a white unit.

Corp. Levi Jackson, Jr. (missing in action), Army Medical Service, United States Army a member of Medical Company, Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment, Twenty-fifth Infantry Division is cited for extraordinary heroism in action against the enemy near Haman, Korea on August 13, 1950. On this date Corporal Jackson was serving as medical aid man with Company G when two men were seriously wounded. Moving across the exposed terrain through the withering enemy small arms and automatic weapons fire, Corporal Jackson reached the men and was administering first aid when the enemy laid a devastating barrage on the area. Heedless of his personal safety, he shielded the two wounded men with his own body in an effort to protect them from further wounds. While in this exposed position he was mortally wounded. Corporal Jackson performed his duties as medical corpsman in a heroic manner. His primary concern at all times was the welfare and prompt treatment of the many wounded. On numerous occasions he evacuated men under the most adverse conditions over treacherous terrain while subjected to constant hostile fire. The outstanding bravery, conspicuous devotion to his comrades, and grim determination displayed by Corporal Jackson exemplify the highest traditions of the American soldier and provide a lasting tribute to himself and to the Army Medical Service. Entered the military service from Pennsylvania.

Second Lt. Levy V. Hollis (then master sergeant), Infantry, United States Army. Lieutenant Hollis, a member of Headquarters, Third Battalion, Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment, Twenty-fifth Infantry Division,

displayed extraordinary heroism and leadership ability in action against an armed enemy near Haman, Korea, during the period August 21 to August 24, 1950. Lieutenant Hollis' battalion was engaged in a fierce fire fight with the enemy for the strategically important high ground near Haman, Korea, known as Battle Mountain or Bald Hill. Despite the fact that his job as battalion operations sergeant would ordinarily confine him to the battalion command post, he constantly moved under heavy enemy machine-gun, mortar, and small-arms fire from one end of the sector to the other coordinating the fire and attack of assault elements and providing invaluable assistance to the battalion commander. Throughout this period he was active in organizing stragglers from the assault units of the battalion. He accompanied the battalion commander to front-line positions on numerous occasions and on August 22, 1950, moved through intense enemy fire to carry ammunition to a strategically placed machine-gun position. On August 24, 1950, battalion front-line troops withdrew after being heavily attacked by a numerically superior enemy force. Lieutenant Hollis, after rounding up stragglers, reorganized them as they came off the hill. Issuing weapons to those who had lost them in the attack or whose weapon was not functioning properly, he personally led them in a counterattack. His courage and initiative inspired the men to perform prodigious feats of arms and pushed the enemy off the position. At all times during this period he voluntarily led and directed carrying parties with vital supplies of water and ammunition to assault elements in the thick of the fight. The extraordinary heroism of Lieutenant Hollis reflects great credit on himself and the military service. Entered the military service from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, among my constituents in my congressional district in Los Angeles, there is a highly respected and responsible group whose primary objective is to assist their fellow citizens of Mexican and Spanish descent to become integrated into every phase of our community life. This group once wrote to me protesting an Army policy which classified them as Mexicans instead of Caucasians.

The letter gave an account of a specific incident of a citizen of Spanish descent being interviewed in an Army recruiting office. The interviewer, according to Army policy, scratched out the word white on the enlistment form and inserted Mexican. I would like to quote a paragraph of this letter which comments on the incident:

This practice will unquestionably do considerable damage to the recruiting program in the entire Southwest. In this general area persons of Mexican ancestry total well over 3,000,000 individuals and represent the largest single minority group. Since the great majority of them are attempting to become a part of the life-stream of the community and the Nation, any attempt to forestall this ambition by treating them as a group apart is extremely repellent to them and give rise to demoralization and hostility. The fostering of such attitudes is not only destructive of the democratic processes, but is scarcely conducive to the creation of a receptive state of mind on the part of political recruits.

Under present practices in the Army, citizens of Latin ancestry are no longer set apart because we were able to obtain a revision of the policy. The Winstead amendment is an invitation to scrap that

change and return to the old system. Even now, the Army follows certain racial classifications that would be covered by the Winstead amendment.

We do not want an Army of colored people or a Navy of Chinese or an Air Force of white people. We want our armed services to use all Americans for whatever duties they are capable of performing.

The policy of segregation and discrimination based on race must be abolished from the armed services.

We must not permit segregation to be written into this universal military training legislation. We must, instead, take active measures to stamp it out and expressly provide that all men who serve in our Armed Forces receive equal treatment.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Price amendment. I think we ought to look at the provision itself and see if it means anything the way it is written. From the questions that have been asked it appears that there is segregation only for enlisted men it has been stated because they are discharged as such when they apply for officer status.

Secondly, on the comments that have been made on the floor here so far, "military necessity," on line 3, page 54 of the bill, as well as under this amendment, would not mean "military necessity," but would mean only "where practicable."

Third, on the definition of the word "race," there are five races in the world, and so far the debate has only been between the white and the brown and the black race. As a matter of fact, there are Congressmen here that are part Indian, and I wonder whether they would be in segregated units under this provision.

Lastly, in defining "race" how far back do you go? What is the definition as to a man's antecedents? Does the man have to have either great grandparent colored or Indian, or any other race, Chinese or Hawaiian for example, and then is he entitled to choose his race on registration? Well, there is no such definition given.

Gentlemen, I think the amendment is unworkable because it will divide the Armed Forces into the present nonsegregated units as the present units are now, and then will segregate for all time, the future draftees. I do not think this provision can be administratively worked out, because it has to work not only for the man for 1 year, one particular group or unit, but to follow him anywhere in any future assignment both in the military and training service. Where will the red tape end?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the time allotted to me to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I was born in the South. I lived there all during the days of my young manhood. When World War I broke out I was above the draft age. I did not have to go, but I believed then as I believe now that it was the duty of every citizen, when the welfare of the nation in which he claims citizenship is at stake, to rally to the call and to give his life, if need be, for the preservation of that nation.

I went to war. I was commissioned WILLIAM L. DAWSON, first lieutenant of infantry. I led Americans in battle—black Americans. This mark you see here on my forehead is the result of German mustard gas. This left shoulder of mine is today a slip joint. I cannot raise this left arm any higher than the shoulder unless I lift it with the other hand. That would have been a good joint, hospitalization would have been available, if I had not been a Negro American. I served in a segregated outfit as a citizen trying to save this country. How long, how long, my confreres and gentlemen from the South, will you divide us Americans on account of color? Give me the test that you would apply to make anyone a full-fledged American, and by the living God, if it means death itself, I will pay it. But, give it to me. Why should this body go on record at a time when we are fighting a world war to brand a section of its citizenry as second class. I have sat in the well of this House and I have seen you gentlemen from the South, and rightly so, stand up and applaud members of other races, nonwhite races, who were darker than I am. I have seen you applaud them, yet you will take me, a citizen of the United States, of your own flesh and blood, and brand me with second-class citizenship. If there is one place in America where there should not be segregation, that place is in the armed services, among those who fight for this country. Oh, I know how some of you feel, but there is but one God and there is but one race of men all made in the image of God. I did not make myself black any more than you made yourselves white, and God did not curse me when he made me black any more than he cursed you when he made you white. I would give up this life of mine to preserve this country and every American in it, white or black. Deny to me today, if you will, all that American citizenship stands for, I will still fight to preserve our Nation knowing that someday under the Constitution of the United States all of these restrictions will be removed, and that we will move forward before the world as one people, American people, joined in a democracy which shall set the pattern for all the world.

I say to you who claim to love America, in this hour of its stress that the greatest argument the Soviet Union is using among the black peoples of this world to turn them against you is your treatment of me and Americans like me.

No; I do not believe this body means to go off on this tangent, and I believe you who come from the South, if you would

look back a little bit, would never, never again take a step to handicap any one of God's children for what they are. I believe that the South is big enough for all of us to live in together in peace and in happiness if we can but have understanding; but we cannot have understanding if you array one against another because of color.

I hope you will vote for the Price amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, after those very fine words of our distinguished colleague from Illinois, perhaps some of the rest of us should not say too much, but I want to point out that I think if the words of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] are left in the bill, it will be unwise and a backward step.

I think all of you realize that the Department of the Army has been slower than the Air Force and the Navy in implementing the policy of nonsegregation and integration of all troops. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has explained, we together made an official visit recently to Fort Dix, which is in my congressional district. There they have found, as he suggested, that it was not practical even to segregate the troops in the training regiments they have at that post. Previously they had segregated them there, and then tried to integrate them after they were trained, but they found that even that was not practical. We found that there at Fort Dix this policy is working very well. There is no complaint as to how this integration was working from any source. There is a great improvement in the morale of the Negro troops. Training is going on. Men from all sections of the country and of all colors and creeds are living together in the barracks. They are having their recreation together and their training together. All in all, it is working very, very well. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois would not require the armed services to do anything beyond what they are now doing under official policy. Why upset a policy which I am convinced is making progress, and which is, to a large extent, contributing to a fuller utilization of our manpower? Let us give it a further trial.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, while the so-called manpower bill, formally designated as S. 1, is not perfect, it is, in my judgment, the best that can be developed under present circumstances. I am pleased with the provisions of the bill as they relate to lowering the age for induction. It is hoped that the calling of these young men 18½ years of age will make it possible to curtail the calling of and permit the release of combat veterans of World War II. To be sure, we do not like to call young men into service, but all of us must make sacrifices it seems; and the provisions of this measure, in part at least, tend to divide the burden.

Through the years, I of course have been an advocate of universal military training and intend to vote against the Barden bill which would separate extension of the Selective Service Act from the universal military feature. All in all, the bill as presented by the Armed Services Committee seems to be fair and the best that can be agreed upon at this time. I am therefore giving it my full support.

Of course, I intend to offer an amendment to the committee bill in an effort to throw at least some safeguards around younger men, who will be leaving home for the first time, with reference to temptations such as intoxicating beverages and houses of ill fame.

It seems to me that the so-called Abernethy provision in the bill is entirely proper. Many of us in the South still adhere to the belief that we should continue to have complete segregation of the races. There is a gradual change in the viewpoint of a lot of our people and, no doubt, eventually this seemingly impossible problem will solve itself. In his inaugural address, our new governor speaking for our people this past January, indicated his and the willingness of all of us to make additional sacrifices so as to provide better educational opportunities to members of the Negro race.

As we call these fine young men into the service, some of them will be leaving home for the first time. Recalling my own early days in the service, I remember the drastic changes in my accustomed way of living which, of necessity, had to be adopted. There are changes which are not so necessary. The idea of a sudden and complete integration and/or amalgamation of the races comes as a terrific shock to a lot of us from the South. The invoking of this ironclad rule has done and will continue to do more to create friction and reduce efficiency and harmony in the service than anything I can think of. Early in my life I discovered these lines from the pen of the poet, Sir Thomas Moore, who said:

Shall I ask the brave soldier who fights by my side in the cause of mankind if our creeds agree? Shall I forget the true friend so valued and tried if he kneel not before the same altar with me?

I have no religious or racial prejudice. I have never consciously discriminated against or committed a wrong against any person. My views now, I believe, are consistent with my stated philosophy of life as I advocate the retention of the Abernethy provision in the bill. What harm could come if this permission is given to young service people to elect for themselves whether they will serve in a segregated or nonsegregated company? It might be that there are some Negroes who would prefer rather to serve in a complete Negro unit than to serve in a white unit where they will always be decidedly in the minority. I believe there can be little dispute that the average white person is more alert in his mental capacity than the average Negro. This being so, a Negro will have a hard time winning any rank in a company in which the majority of his fellows are white. I sincerely hope that the Price

amendment will be defeated and that the committee bill will be enacted into law without further delay.

SEGREGATION A RELIC OF THE PAST

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, we should face the future freed of anachronisms like segregation. We weaken our Armed Forces with deliberate separations between whites and blacks. We must strengthen rather than weaken our armed might in the cold war against communism. Segregation can only afford aid and comfort to Communist propaganda. It is grist to the Russian mill.

The administration and Department of Defense are all opposed to this unfortunate practice. They realize the baneful implications of transforming our Armed Forces into organizations of units divided as to race.

How tragic it is that at this day and age men must fight and die with tags on marked "first-class citizen" and "second-class citizen." Bullets find their mark and victim regardless of race or color. The hand of death knows no color. The grim reaper strikes in all directions. He does not say, "For blacks only" or "for whites only."

What leadership can we assert in the United Nations, whose forces fight together in Korea, if we insist upon segregation? UN is representative of all mankind, not whites only.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, of course, I am favoring the Price amendment. It is paradoxical to consider legislation enabling us to prepare for the struggle for democratic principles, and at the same time to have the most undemocratic Whitten provision in this bill, and I am voting to strike it out.

The first speech I ever made in the House was a plea for the eradication of second-class citizenship and I shall continue to work and vote accordingly.

I must compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] for his exceptionally moving plea in this connection.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the excellent presentation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] in support of the Price motion to strike the Winstead amendment from the universal military training bill, thereby aiming to eliminate segregation in our Armed Forces. My distinguished colleague from New York rightfully stated that what we need is not segregation but integration of men in the services, and he pointed to the example being set in Korea and the magnificent combat record already attained by Negro soldiers—something which all of us recognize and of which we are all proud.

I was very much impressed by the statement of my good friend, Representative POWELL, when he said that no one in the Pentagon today favors segregation in the armed services. When he

asked for those who know of anyone in the Pentagon favoring segregation to speak up, not a single voice was raised. I want to take this opportunity to commend Representative POWELL for the very forceful statement he made here today.

Although it is difficult to add any more potent reasons for the elimination of segregation than those already mentioned by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], I should like to express a few thoughts on the subject.

The time is long overdue for us to eliminate all remains of racialism in the military forces and thereby help to keep clear the good name of the United States. Liberty-loving people throughout the world recognize our country as the leader in the cause of democracy and human rights. We have always been in the forefront of the struggle to establish and maintain the unique right of every man to be respected. In the same manner, it is our sacred duty to see that all citizens of the United States should be afforded the privilege and the opportunity to serve their country with dignity and pride.

A little over a year ago—on February 16, 1950—I brought this situation to the attention of this House and on that occasion I stated as follows:

The Negro, though in our history he has been subjected to second-hand citizenship or to no citizenship at all, has played a very large and very honorable part in all the wars of the United States. . . . We have always asked the Negro to shed his blood for the United States, and he has done so, in spite of frequent shabby treatment. Such loyalty is one of our greatest national assets.

The heroism and participation of the Negro in the American wars, beginning with the Revolutionary War and through the present conflict in Korea, is a matter of record. We are now faced with a situation all over the world, especially among the millions of people in Asia who are closely following our treatment of minorities, where Communist propaganda exploits this situation and points out to the nonwhite peoples of the world this gap between our principles of democracy and our performance of these principles.

Segregation is not only undemocratic, but it is wasteful when practiced in the armed services and intolerable at a time when we should apply utmost efficiency and coordination in our defense efforts for the welfare of the Nation. I support the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] and urge its adoption.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the antisegregation amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

If the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] is adopted, it would serve notice on our critics across the sea that we in America do not practice the free democracy of which we so enthusiastically boast.

The fighting men of our Armed Forces, in the thick of battle, whether it is in no-man's land, in the air, or on the sea, never stop to ask the skin color of their comrades fighting by their side. This so-called amendment, although the

words are not expressed, nevertheless implies that we not only have second-class citizens in civilian life, but second-class servicemen in our Armed Forces. It is indeed a sad commentary if this Congress sinks to the error of recognizing racism in our Military Establishments.

Americans are constantly orating about their great heritage of freedom and equality. We must be practical and eliminate racial hatreds and group intolerances whether it is in the military or in civilian life. Intolerance in the military helps to defeat the very thing that we are spending billions of dollars and sacrificing thousands of American lives combating. The opposition to a segregated military is not confined to Negro groups by any means. Great national organizations, industrial, labor, civic, and otherwise have protested against segregation in our Armed Forces. In the last war, the bravery and fighting ability of the Negro soldiers were lauded by the British, the Australians, General Eisenhower, and others, too numerous to mention.

The Negro women served with great distinction in the Army Nurse Corps and enlisted in the WAVES, WAC, and SPARS. After these great demonstrations of patriotism, bravery, and valor, why should we say to these Americans, "You must live in barracks on the other side of the camp; you also must eat your meals there"?

Our Nation is made up of a cosmopolitan representation of peoples from all races, nationalities, and creeds. Great progress has been made in the last 20 years toward eliminating intolerance and bigotry. We must not relax now. This segregation amendment would not only hamper the operation of our Armed Forces and promote inefficiency, but would lower the morale of our fighting men, regardless of race.

I am confident that this Congress will adopt the so-called Price amendment and prohibit segregation in our Armed Forces.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, the Winstead amendment is the most sensible approach that has been made to the question of segregation in the armed services. I believe that any fair-minded person will concede that it is nothing but right and fair to permit the registrants to express their choice of serving in either a segregated or nonsegregated unit. This is democratic. It is fair. It eliminates the difficulties which have come from the President's order striking down segregation in the armed services and which forces all of the men to serve in nonsegregated units regardless of their wishes or the effect which it has upon their morale.

Leaders of our Armed Forces will tell you that the President's nonsegregation order has been nothing but a troublemaker. It has not been a morale builder. On the contrary it has lowered the morale of thousands of young men, white and black, in the services.

Nonsegregation is something which most of the politicians preach but do not practice except occasionally during their political campaigns. They do not believe

in it, they do not live it and they do not teach it. They use it entirely as a lure to secure the votes of minority groups and I do not know of any who have been more successful in that regard than some of the members on the Democratic side of the aisle.

It is my firm conviction that if you strike out the Winstead amendment you may jeopardize the entire bill. Certainly you should consider the question from this angle.

I urge you not to adopt the Price amendment. I am sure that the military will administer the Winstead provision in a democratic manner. I am sure they will permit anyone who wishes to serve in nonsegregated units to do so and I believe they will make an effort to permit those who wish to serve in nonsegregated units so to do. What could be more democratic?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this point simply for the purpose of pointing out to the committee and to the Members of the House, how much more effective the type of debate in which we are presently indulging, than the type which many of you Members may recall we have had in the past. I, too, commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED] on their approach to this problem which I appreciate as well as they do, is a difficult one and which cannot be solved overnight, and which also cannot be solved by demagogues either on the floor of the House or elsewhere. I think it is refreshing indeed—like a breath of fresh air—to take up a question dealing with segregation on such a high plane to note how much more effective this debate is, than the rantings and ravings on this question that have been indulged in here in this House and elsewhere on previous occasions. I hope this is symptomatic of what may occur in the future, whether we discuss segregation in the armed services, or in schools or residences or any of the vexing questions affecting minority groups in this country.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I join the gentleman in that statement. I think the debate has been splendid and at a very high level. It is indeed very inspiring.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, appreciate the way in which this problem has been discussed on this floor, and the fair way my distinguished colleague [Mr. WINSTEAD] has handled this entire problem. I would like to call attention to the fact that up until after this World War II was over, the military did handle this most difficult problem. I have always thought that this country came to glorious victory in all past wars when this question was in the hands of the military, but we have in this country—and they are entitled to their opinion—certain social reformers

who want to change the segregation policies which exist in certain sections. I differ with them but that is their privilege. Progress is being made by them, who, like all reformers, want to wrap around that which they believe in the force and power of the Federal Government to carry out their wishes regardless of the feelings of others or the results. I think that is a mistake in any case but to tie up such law with national defense is tragic indeed. At any rate from the arguments you have heard from people in northern areas, they do not care for segregation. If the Winstead amendment were the law, they seem to say here today, the people who would desire segregated companies would be the southern white people. I doubt that, but if that be true, why not give them that privilege? Even there the Army would still determine in each case where segregation was practical. Do you not realize that in the South you have had the greatest percentage of volunteers that you have had at any place in the country? The Winstead amendment simply gives back to the Army the right to run the Army as they did run it before segregation was abolished by Presidential directive, which was issued under political pressure.

In the Winstead amendment you provide for segregation where it is desired and feasible. Strike it out and you provide for nonsegregation in all instances regardless even though it be impractical, not desired, and may, in some cases, bring about serious consequences.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] is recognized.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, the formation of an army by selective service is a most difficult and most serious task. It is not a vehicle for social reform or social experiment.

Our colleague from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] made a very touching speech a moment ago. But do not forget, he has been honored as every other Representative in this body for many years. He has been made chairman of a great committee, and he has been treated with great respect and affection by all Members of this body, including those from the South. What is wrong with a system that gives such opportunity?

Mr. Chairman, it is most unfortunate that circumstances make it necessary to bring young men out of homes and regiment them into an army for the purpose of destroying the enemy. It would be far more unfortunate to use that force for social reform and social experiment. The Whitten amendment is fair, democratic, and in keeping with our best traditions.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. FORRESTER. As I understand you, you are making the point that you cannot understand just why it is that we want to make these boys who are drafted into our Army unwilling guinea pigs for social experiments that are not being conducted and not being practiced by any other group in the United States.

Mr. LYLE. That is exactly right. We will have a stronger Army if the Price amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time this afternoon to say a few words to my colleagues on the Republican side. This is not a speech for home consumption. All of you are familiar, I am sure, with the founding of the Republican Party and the high principles which gave it life. Our great party was born to set men free. Whenever and wherever the Republican Party has flourished the rights of human beings are advanced and living conditions improved. The Republican Party has always been in the forefront of every great fight for human rights. Today on the floor of the House we are charged with pulling somebody's chestnuts out of the fire, and the same representations are made by Democratic orators at meetings of our colored citizens in northern cities.

I am sure the vote on the Price amendment this afternoon will demonstrate that with few exceptions the Republicans here today will vote in support of the Price amendment. The planks in the Republican platform, not only of 1950, but from the time of its origin, were not intended to be fishhooks to catch suckers with. Republicans today will recognize the vote for the Price amendment as a further opportunity to demonstrate that deeds are more important than words.

I hope my Republican colleagues will not emulate so many of the orators on the other side of the aisle. The Democratic Party's constant profession of love for all people is constantly being mocked by the activities of those areas where it derives its greatest political strength. Time after time, despite the vast outpouring of speeches dealing with every phase of civil rights, nondiscrimination, and brotherhood, the words have been completely denied in practice. When the Democratic Party starts practicing what it preaches, there will be a new era of advancement and growth for the Southland. Until then, the mockery of human brotherhood which characterizes the Democratic lip service remains a blight upon the party and a lesson for all Americans in a world where discrimination and segregation are no longer merely local issues, but are part and parcel of the world clash between east and west. The vote on this amendment will be taken in a very few minutes, and all Members and the press will have an opportunity to observe on which side of the House we will find the greatest support for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized to close the debate.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, for 60 long days from 10 o'clock until oftentimes 4 and 5 o'clock in the afternoon the Armed Services Committee conducted hearings on what is probably the most important bill that will come before the House during this session. We heard over a hundred witnesses either by word of mouth or statements inserted in the

RECORD. For over a week we sat in executive session writing the various provisions of this bill. The committee by a vote of 32 to 3 reported the present bill.

I am supporting the bill as submitted to the House in every line and sentence. There has not been a single amendment offered that in my judgment has improved the committee bill. The committee concluded to write in what is known as the Winstead amendment; the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. PRICE], is moving to knock it out. As chairman of the committee I do not feel that I can support any amendment of substance which would be at variance with the committee's actions. Therefore, I am voting against the Price amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PRICE) there were—ayes 131, noes 106.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KILDAY and Mr. PRICE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 178, noes 126.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENNY to the Barden substitute: on page 8, strike out lines 1 through 3, and insert the following:

"(k) Section 4 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(k) (1) Each person who, subsequent to the date of the enactment of this subsection, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces prior to attaining the twentieth anniversary of his birth, shall receive his initial military training (while simultaneously receiving academic training) at a school or college selected by the Secretary of Defense.

"(2) Any person designated by the Secretary of Defense who, subsequent to the date of the enactment of this subsection, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces on or after attaining the twentieth anniversary of his birth, may receive his initial military training (while simultaneously receiving academic training) at a school or college selected by the Secretary of Defense.

"(3) The Secretary of Defense shall enter into contracts or other arrangements with the schools and colleges selected by him for the establishment of initial military training units under this subsection. Each such contract or arrangement shall appropriately provide, on a reimbursable basis, for the utilization by the school or college concerned of its existing personnel, buildings, plant, and facilities in furnishing academic training, meals, lodging, and related services to persons assigned to such school or college to receive initial military training under this subsection. In the administration of this subsection, no officer or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of such school or college, except that the contract or arrangement entered into under this paragraph may establish the nature and extent of the academic training to be provided at such school or college under this subsection.

"(4) Whenever an initial military training unit shall have been established under this subsection at any school or college, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as may be appropriate, shall issue such arms and equipment, and shall detail for duty as instructors or as administrative or other personnel such officers and enlisted men, as may be necessary to insure that the initial military training provided in such unit will be adequate and effective. The commanding officer of each initial military training unit shall have complete supervision over the military training and over the discipline of the persons serving therein.

"(5) The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe such regulations and standards as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Chairman, I am taking into consideration the fact that the next few days are going to be good fishing days, and also, something that has not been noted, Monday is baseball day, and we all want to get through before then.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment which I have offered and my argument will be clear, precise, and indubitable. I have made it just as short as I possibly can. I think it is very brief and very readily understood. I hope for that reason that a great many of you will vote for it.

My amendment makes it mandatory for all young men under the age of 20 to continue their education at a school or college selected by the Secretary of Defense simultaneously with and at the same place as they are undergoing basic or initial training in the military forces whether it be for a period of 4 or 8 months.

This plan arose because of my experience in the Air Force in the last war. Up to 1944 the basic training of the pilots who came into the Air Force, and there was a tremendous backlog then, as I believe there is going to be a tremendous backlog of trainees again, was given to them at Miami and Nashville and in four or five different places before they could get any real learning on pilot training. This continual basic training, basic training, basic training, is a very, very bad thing for these young men. They had nothing of interest to do, nothing to keep their minds busy, nothing that they enjoyed working with. It was a drudge at best, and many of them got into mischief. Continual hardening of muscles and no book learning was bad. I believe these young men can continue their education and get something constructive out of their basic training while they are getting the training.

I want it thoroughly understood I am not one who believes in being gentle with soldiers. I believe that they should be made tough. I believe they should be made hardy. I think they should be given complete athletic programs. In the last war the training was given in this manner and it was successful. It worked out splendidly when they were given their college training and were able to continue school or college at the same

time that they were getting their basic training. I inspected about 50 of these schools and the morale of the boys after this school system started was just tremendously better than it was before. My own son went through it and I saw it in operation.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENNY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The effect of the gentleman's amendment is to make it mandatory on the Secretary of Defense to utilize the schools in giving basic training to those who are inducted for service and for training; is that correct?

Mr. DENNY. That is for those under 20 years of age.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. But that is the effect of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. DENNY. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. And it applies to a man who is inducted for service as well as the man who enlists and the man who is drafted or appointed? The Secretary must give the contracts to the schools or universities to give him the basic military training at some particular school?

Mr. DENNY. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. In other words, I have stated correctly, then, what the gentleman's amendment does?

Mr. DENNY. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, the short course of college that these boys had in the Air Force during the last war resulted in thousands of them coming back after their military service was over. They went back to college because they had a taste of it. It was the greatest thing for those boys that I think ever happened during the last war. Their school course will be entirely under school authorities during this period of basic military training. Their military training course will be entirely under the military during the period. The military will be the only ones who will have charge of them. They will use the parade grounds and the athletic fields and they will live in the college dormitories and use the mess-hall in the college to which they are assigned. That will materially reduce the cost of this induction program for these young people. Instead of building new cantonments for them, and constructing new places where they have to build mess halls and living facilities and everything else, they will be put into places which are already constructed, with mess halls, all of the necessary buildings in existence, and so forth. The comfort, housing, feeding, and care of the young man will be immeasurably better.

I believe that the cost is a very material thing here.

The fourth point is, and this is more or less incidental, that it will help the colleges tremendously as it did in the last war. They will lose thousands and thousands of boys under this program, but by this method they will be getting more boys.

I have intentionally left out many details of training that might be more fully discussed, for the reason that they would encumber the record and the military prefers to establish such details

for themselves and in their own manner. The infantry soldier becomes a specialist after his first period of basic training. This is also true of the Air Force and Navy candidates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, reading the amendment, it is difficult to understand just where it is supposed to go in the bill. Quite evidently there is some confusion or error, because it seeks to strike out a portion of a section of the bill which authorizes the President to reduce or cancel out training, and it simply does not hook up. It does not become germane at the point mentioned.

But, addressing myself to the substance of the amendment, the gentleman has made it clear that the amendment is intended to make it mandatory upon the Secretary of Defense to assign all persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed, who are under 20 years of age, to educational institutions, to pursue military training along with academic training. It is mandatory that they shall be assigned to educational institutions where the initial period of training will go with academic education. Of course, it would be nice if you could raise an army and train it and leave the men at home to pursue their normal course of life and follow their normal activities and live with their families. Unfortunately you cannot raise and train an army that way. Of course, we will utilize educational institutions. I am in favor of utilizing educational institutions for those portions of the training which can be used for that purpose and at the same time train the soldiers. There is no doubt but that the colleges and educational institutions could be utilized for technical subjects, such as electronics, and things like that, but you cannot raise a foot-soldier army and let them stay in a university until they are 20 years of age and pursue their academic education. You are going to have to uproot them, unfortunate as it may be.

Mr. SHORT. How would you give them training in tanks, and such things?

Mr. KILDAY. Use the football field, I suppose.

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. DENNY. I think my amendment clearly sets out that this is only during the period of their basic training. Their preliminary training. As for tanks and special kinds of guns, that comes in the second type of basic training. You do not call it exactly basic training. My whole purpose in this is that when they come out of the Army they will come out better soldiers and better citizens of the Nation.

Mr. KILDAY. Unfortunately, we cannot reach the state of efficiency and numbers in the Army that we have to have and pursue business as usual. It is going to be necessary, unfortunate as it may be—and I know of no one who approaches this legislation with any degree of enthusiasm whatever—but if you are going to have military training you are going to have to have military training

with all the hardening and everything else that goes with it.

The amendment, of course, would greatly handicap—well, it would throw the whole program into a state of confusion.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENNY].

The amendment was rejected.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS to the amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: Page 19, lines 13 and 14, strike out "Any member of the inactive or volunteer Reserve" and insert the following: "Any member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces"; and before the period in line 25, insert the following: "; and any person so released from active duty shall at the time of such release be permitted to resign from the Reserve component of which he is a member."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing complex about this amendment. The first provision simply takes in the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

The second provision of my amendment permits these veteran reserves only, you understand, who have been released after 12 months of service to resign. The bill provides that the veteran reserves may be released after 12 months' service, but neither the committee bill nor the Barden amendment—

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. So the Committee can understand, the Committee's provision applies to the inactive or volunteer reserves. The gentleman's amendment includes all reservists which would include the National Guard; and, therefore, the effect of the gentleman's amendment would be that over some four or five hundred thousand would be immediately subject to fall within the purview of the gentleman's amendment and be relieved from duty within 1 year. Is not that correct?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman's amendment would practically destroy the Army that is in the field today, because it orders by statute that at least four or five hundred thousand would have to immediately come out, and you would find yourself in this kind of position—

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell me how many are going to be released under the provisions of his bill?

Mr. VINSON. Under the provisions of the House bill, 233,000; and we confine it only to the inactive and volunteer reserves. The gentleman goes one step further and makes it applicable to the National Guard and organized reserves; in other words, his amendment would emasculate the calling of the reserves into the service.

Mr. GROSS. No; my amendment does not do anything of the kind. You release

these men; you say "release;" I say "re-sign" because you do not go ahead and amend the basic law by which the President within 24 hours could call back these veteran reserves into the service. If you say what you mean and if you mean what you say you will permit these veteran reserves to resign so the President cannot reach out and grab them within 24 hours, a week, or a month after you have released them from service. I am going to try to keep any promise made here with these reservists. You say they have been punished; you say they have been the victims of injustice. Then why do you not permit them to resign? I am not forgetting that a whole lot has happened in the last few hours. The President has snuffed out the military career of General MacArthur. And unless the provisions of my amendment are enacted, the President could, in a few hours, snuff out the civilian careers of veteran reservists who had been released after 12 months' of active duty by recalling them again.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman raised a question the other day in debate, and a very pertinent one, that after he had been relieved he could be called back. I grant the gentleman that is correct. So when we get back to the committee bill there will be offered an amendment in line with what the gentleman has already said; but the gentleman in this amendment is going entirely too far because he is making it applicable to the entire Reserve organization of the Army.

Mr. GROSS. If the Reserves and the National Guard have been in active service for 12 months why should they be discriminated against?

Mr. VINSON. They belonged to an organized unit and have been paid. Those who serve in inactive units are not paid.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I must confess I am not quite sure I understand the effect of the gentleman's amendment. If the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has within his knowledge information of the type of amendment that should be attached to the bill I would think the proper and fair thing would be to offer it to this substitute because there is a very strong possibility the gentleman will not get back to his bill.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is just building up useless hopes.

Mr. BARDEN. Maybe I am, but I honestly and frankly ask the gentleman, he being in possession of the type of information he thinks should go into this bill, if he will not offer it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. If the gentleman has a workable and necessary amendment to the Barden amendment, then in all fairness to the House it should be offered at this time and the House given an opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. VINSON. May I say that the gentleman from Iowa the other day raised a very pertinent question in regard to the Reserves. He said a reservist could be relieved after 12 months and could be called back immediately. Technically speaking, that is absolutely accurate and the gentleman was correct. The proposal that I shall offer will fix it so that cannot be done within 30 days after he leaves the service, or for more than 30 days.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON. He cannot be recalled for more than a period of 30 days, except in case of war or national emergency.

Mr. GROSS. He is released only for 30 days?

Mr. VINSON. No, no. He cannot be called back in excess of 30 days except in case of war or national emergency.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. If the hearings before the committee have justified that proposal and it is acceptable to the committee and the gentleman will accept that as a substitute for his amendment, then insofar as I am capable of doing, I will approve the gentleman's acceptance of this and will follow along that channel.

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to accept it if it will be offered as an amendment to the Barden amendment.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman can accept this and offer it as a substitute for his amendment.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will restrict his other part of the amendment, then I will be glad for the gentleman to offer this to the Barden bill or to the committee bill, which does the right and proper thing. After a reservist has been relieved, after 12 months, he cannot be called back for a longer period than 30 days except in case of war or national emergency declared by the Congress. The gentleman is in error when he goes as far as his amendment does because it completely destroys the Organized Reserves and the National Guard.

Mr. GROSS. I will accept that amendment, although I do not agree that my original amendment would destroy the Reserves or National Guard. They could serve for 12 months on active duty.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman would not want to go as far as his amendment goes for the reason some of these reservists perhaps are looking toward retirement, for instance. Under Public Law 810 after 20 years of service he is entitled to some sort of retirement. Some may want to go through on that basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman's amendment might go so far as to preclude a reservist who is anxious to stay in until he is eligible for retirement under Public Law 810 in order to accomplish the benefits that he has been looking forward to for a long, long time.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman that nothing in my amendment precludes them from continuing in the Reserves if they want to. It is not mandatory that they resign. I say again that my original amendment, and the substitute which I am now prepared to offer, is designed simply to prevent President Truman or any other President from yanking veteran reserves, with 12 months of active duty, back into the service for light and transient reasons. No one can deny that reservists, during past months, have been the victims of shameful and intolerable treatment. It is to help put an end to this that I have taken the floor this afternoon.

I appreciate the fairness and cooperation of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]; the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] in connection with the amendment which I trust will now be adopted.

Mr. BROOKS. I will say further that the amendment which the chairman proposes is an amendment which will accomplish the results that the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS to the amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: Page 19, line 25, after the word "duty", strike out the period and add the following: "and shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty for periods in excess of 30 days without his consent except in time of war or national emergency hereafter to be declared by the Congress."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned and as far as the Members sitting at the table are concerned, we accept the amendment, because the amendment is right and proper.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] to the Barden amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, those Members of Congress who yesterday predicted that there

would be great rejoicing among the Communists and those persons who follow the Communist line, did not have to wait long for confirmation of those comments.

I hold in my hand a copy of today's edition of the Daily Worker. I shall quote two or three paragraphs from this front-page editorial which bear out the fact that those Members who made such predictions knew what they were talking about.

Under this 72-point heading "Now end the war," this editorial from this Communist Party periodical reads:

A tremendous feeling of gratification will be felt all over the Nation today that the war-hungry General MacArthur who called openly for world war III has been fired by the Government. With the firing of this arrogant militarist, the peace camp of the world has won an important gain which opens up very great opportunities to advance the cause of peace. MacArthur is out. Now the war in Korea must be ditched as well.

Then further on in the editorial there appears this paragraph:

All Americans who rejoice today that the war-incendiary MacArthur is out owe it to themselves to put enormous public pressure on the Government to negotiate for peace in Asia with China, and for peace in Europe with the Soviet Union.

Further on in the editorial it says:

Common sense and the national interest demand that President Truman return Formosa to its rightful owner, China; that a cease fire in Korea be immediately established with negotiations for the rapid withdrawal of all non-Korean forces leaving the Korean people to decide their own destiny. China must be admitted to the UN.

Then on page 3 there is a comment by William Z. Foster, general chairman of the Communist Party. Under the heading "Good riddance to MacArthur," Foster says:

The forced retirement of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his position as mikado and general imperialist dictator in the Far East will be welcomed with a sense of relief over the world. MacArthur's whole course, especially since the outbreak of the war in Korea, has been to spread the war in Asia and thus precipitate a third world war. His steps in this direction have been bold, brazen, and unmistakable.

Then in conclusion Foster writes:

Good riddance to MacArthur. All peace-loving people may well rejoice at his being fired. But if his displacement is to be made into a real step toward peace, this can be done only by sailing into the Hoovers, Tafts, McCarthys, and Knowlands, who are backing him, and especially by defeating the militaristic plans of the even larger menace of war represented by the Truman administration itself.

Now I recall that Mr. Truman, in his radio address to the Nation last night, expressed the hope and belief that a peaceful settlement of the Korean War may still be possible with the Communists. There is every indication, Mr. Chairman, that we are heading for that kind of a settlement in an effort to extract Mr. Truman from the very difficult situation in which he finds himself and the Nation today as the result of his war in Korea. I fear the peaceful settlement he hopes for will have to be made on the terms laid down by the

Communists in their Daily Worker today. It appears to me that the Communist peace offensive is likely to succeed.

While listening to President Truman last night I wondered if we have not already lost the war by the discharge of General MacArthur; that the lives of some 9,000 or 10,000 American boys, not to speak of 50,000 other American casualties, have not been lost in vain.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman left out one line in the editorial, and that is that the peace terms would be dictated by the Kremlin.

Mr. SHAFER. I did not read that.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Is it not true, as the gentleman has so eloquently pointed out, that this is in line with the phony and infamous peace offensive of Russia, and also with the recent recommendations of the British Foreign Office that we turn Formosa over to the Chinese Reds and take the Reds into the United Nations?

Mr. SHAFER. That is true. It was not over 3 weeks ago they made those recommendations.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman highly on bringing this to the attention of the House at this time.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE to the Barden amendment: On page 3, strike out all of lines 17 through 24, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) Within the limits of the over-all military manpower needs of the United States and notwithstanding any other provision of law any person whether a citizen of the United States or of any friendly nation and any national of Western Germany or Japan who meets all the other qualifications for service in the Armed Forces of the United States and who is determined by the Armed Forces of the United States to be attached to the principles of freedom and democracy shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction for service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

"The terms of service and grade, commissioned or enlisted, for persons not citizens of the United States and accepted for enlistment under this section shall be in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the President: *Provided, however*, That no such person not a citizen of the United States shall be given a grade higher than that of captain or its equivalent.

"*Provided further*, That no veterans' benefits as now or as may be hereafter provided by the laws of the United States shall accrue to any enlistee or officer not a citizen of the United States and accepted under the provisions of this section; nor shall any such enlistee or officer acquire any special rights or preference in connection with the attainment of United States citizenship by reason of the service authorized herein."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, we are faced today with the responsibility of securing for the Armed Forces of the United States a substantial amount of manpower. Traditionally we have

sought that manpower from among the young men of the Nation whose welfare they defended. We must continue to rely upon the young men of America as the backbone of our national defense, although today our Armed Forces are committed to the defenses not only of the United States but of the entire free world. It seems to me that it would be a tragic and an unfair thing indeed if we were to close our eyes to the fact that there are other and very substantial sources of manpower within the free world outside of the United States. These men of other lands are well able to contribute to the defense of freedom throughout the world. They should be given the opportunity to do so. In fact, it seems to me that they owe the same obligation that our boys owe.

I cannot find it in my heart to say that we must confine all of the sacrifice to American boys. American boys are going to do their part as they always have, but we should not call upon American boys to make all of the sacrifices. We can compel our own boys to serve in the defense of world peace. We are, in fact, doing so by this very bill. It is true that we cannot compel a boy in Western Germany, or in Japan to join in the defense of the same freedom for which we draft Americans, but his country, his freedom, is involved no less than that of the American boy we draft.

We cannot draft this foreign boy, but we can offer him a job. We can say to him that if he wants to join with our own boys in the defense of his home as well as ours, that we will pay him well. Any time it is possible to spend American dollars to save American lives, I feel that we should spend the dollars. If we fail to take advantage of the opportunity to share the sacrifices required by this bill with other beneficiaries of American protection, then may it not be that the blood of American boys will be upon us.

I think that here this afternoon we have the opportunity to save American lives. How many, I do not know. But if it is but the life of one American boy, we should make the effort to save that life. We have the opportunity to secure enlistments in many parts of the world. Certainly, those of you who have visited Germany know there are no better jobs in that war ravaged country than in the American Army. Those of you who have visited Japan know that the Japanese cannot expect to receive any kind of job which would give them anywhere near the income or the opportunity which service in the American Armed Forces would give him. I anticipate if we make this offer we can secure, if we so desire, probably a million men in Europe and another million men in Asia to serve in the American Army under American officers to carry out an American program. When we do that we avoid the problem of leadership at the hands of leaders of questionable ability or purpose. We then have American control over those men. Certainly we may not be able to displace a million American boys by using a million foreigners. I do not think we can. But if we can displace one American boy by using three foreigners, would it not be a good investment?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman have in mind, for example, the Nationalists in Formosa?

Mr. POAGE. I think we could probably enlist a large part of the present Nationalist army under the American flag, under American command. The only question which has been raised with respect to these troops is as to their leadership. Certainly nobody questions that there are hard, tough fighters in Formosa. But let us put them under American leadership. Let us put them where they can do the job for America without any question of some leader selling out. This bill provides that we will not give any higher rating than a captaincy to any of these foreign nationals. It also makes it absolutely clear that no one will ever receive American citizenship as a result of such service. I do not propose to bribe anybody by offering them American citizenship. But I do propose simply to say if they want to draw the pay of an American soldier, they should enlist in the American Army, and if they do the job, they will get the pay. And, incidentally, it is going to cost far less to maintain a division of Germans in Germany, or a division of Japanese in Japan than it costs to maintain a division of Americans in either country, or at home in the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I anticipate that the opponents of your amendment will charge that this is a radical departure from the American tradition. At the same time, they propose that we depart very definitely from that tradition by the imposition of universal military training as written by the Pentagon. I can see no objection whatsoever to your amendment.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. I think everyone who is interested in saving the lives of American boys by the use of American dollars will be willing to put up the dollars to pay for foreign troops and use them under American command in the American Army. This amendment does just that.

Are we really interested in building a strong, effective, military force for use in all parts of the world, just as quickly and as cheaply as we can, or are we more interested in imposing some system of military control over our own people? Unless the opponents of this amendment can show that it would not supply the needed troops, or that its cost would be out of line, I submit that they have no right to object to it on one hand, and insist on drafting American boys to protect the homes of foreigners, on the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important amendment. If you do what the gentleman's amendment proposes, you will do something that in all probability will put the Army in very poor shape. It will

get the Army so confused and so saturated with thousands upon thousands of people who would be in there only for the purpose of getting \$90 a month, food, and clothing, and not with a real patriotic spirit.

This same question was propounded to General Eisenhower when he was before our committee. The general said while he was a great believer in the French Foreign Legion, he did not want anything like this in the American Army.

You will make one the worst mistakes that the Congress could possibly make if you open up the enlistment of all nationals in the world to the American Army.

In order to put the amendment into operation, you would have to establish induction centers all over the world, because it provides that thousands of allied nationals would "be provided an opportunity to volunteer for induction for service."

The Congress is a pretty levelheaded body. It is very realistic. When we reach the day in the history of this great Republic of ours that Americans will not fight and serve in the Army, then the doom of the Republic is sealed. Let us have an American Army, imbued with the American spirit. What do you want? Do you want an Army of potential DP's? That is what this amendment does.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. No. I will not yield. I will not trespass on the time of the House any more to talk about building an army for the defense of our liberties upon such a broken reed as would be presented by the enlistment of thousands upon thousands of future DP's in America.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas to the amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: Following line 11, page 21, insert a new subsection as follows:

"Sec. 5. No person, corporation, partnership, or association shall sell, supply, give, or have in his or its possession any alcoholic liquors, including beer, ale, or wine, inside the confines of or within a reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, yard, base, cantonment, training, or mobilization place which is being used at the time for military purposes; but the Secretary of Defense may make regulations permitting the sale and use of alcoholic liquors for medicinal purposes. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to take appropriate action to carry out the provisions of this section."

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment. I am just not quite sure of my position on the matter at this time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a simple one, but it is

one that is extremely important. The amendment provides that no intoxicating liquor shall be sold in and around military training camps and that the Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to carry out the provisions of the act. One provision not far different was included during World War I; so it is not absolutely new. That measure was declared to apply only to the Army.

This applies to all of the Armed Forces. This amendment is for the protection of the men in the Armed Forces, not only for them as individuals but to protect them in their physical and mental abilities, if you will, to make them better men, better trained and qualified men in the Armed Forces of our country.

This amendment is very similar to a proposal by the universal military training and service group appointed by the President, including such men as Joseph E. Davies, Truman K. Gibson, Daniel A. Polling, Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, Charles E. Wilson, and Carl T. Compton, chairman of that committee.

I call your attention to a statement that General Marshall made some 2 years ago with respect to the proposal we have before us, and I quote from him as Secretary of State when he said, discussing this very problem here:

We have on the one side a sordid business for the accumulation of money and on the other the interest of every parent in the United States who has a son in the Army, not to mention the responsibility of the War Department to develop an army of the highest quality. This situation must be brought under control, because it is growing serious.

General Marshall has been quoted many times with respect to various provisions of this legislation presently under consideration. That is what he said with respect to this problem when the question of the sale of intoxicating liquor was under consideration back in 1948 when a similar problem was under consideration on the floor of the House.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman for introducing this amendment and to say that I think it will do more to strengthen the Armed Forces of America than anything we can do.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and especially his interest in this amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished chairman of this committee.

Mr. VINSON. Is it not true that the only place on a military reservation where anyone can get a drink—that is, beer, ale, whisky—is in the officers' clubs or noncommissioned officers' clubs? That is what the gentleman is driving at, but you cannot accomplish it under this amendment because this amendment would not reach that at all.

I grant you that when we get down to the question of writing the plan for the inductees for training, it will be highly

proper and important that there be safeguards thrown around the inductees who are brought in for training; and, of course, Congress will see that that is done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then I may say to the distinguished chairman, if this or similar legislation ought to be approved for inductees, and I hope at the proper time it will be done, the same principle should certainly apply to those under the training act he proposes, then it ought to apply to all members of the Armed Forces.

Mr. VINSON. The effect of the gentleman's amendment in actual application would be that a boy would have to leave camp to get his liquor. That cannot be dealt with by the gentleman's amendment. The only place in the camp where liquor is available is in the officers' and noncommissioned officers' clubs and that liquor they buy and keep there themselves. Most of the enlisted men will not have the privilege of participating in the noncommissioned officers' club, so you are going to send them downtown.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The intent of this amendment is to at least prevent the use and sale of intoxicating liquors in and within a reasonable distance of training camps. Of course, if the serviceman is away on leave, the amendment does not protect him against the use of liquor, but it would, if enforced, keep it away from him within the camps and at a reasonable distance therefrom.

Mr. Chairman, the last thing we want is for these boys to be confronted with a temptation that will dull the edges of sensation. Most boys going into the Armed Forces are not drinkers. No one has contended or suggested that liquor will be helpful to them in any respect. I believe, further, anyone who has used alcohol excessively, will tell you it is an enemy that steals away a man's brains. Certainly, the Armed Forces is not the place for men who become addicted to excessive use of alcoholic beverages.

Very unfortunately, we have a few people in this country who, for selfish interests and profits, would, as Dr. Hamaker has well said:

Shut their eyes to the desolation and ruin that may come to many a soldier boy in 21 or 27 months.

It is our job and our responsibility to defend these boys against that sort of thing insofar as we can do so. Let us see to it that men in uniform will find it difficult rather than easy to take on a thing that is bound to do them harm and at the same time make them less valuable as members of the Armed Forces.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. Chairman, I would not at this time attempt to say how far the gentleman's amendment goes. I do say that to throw it into the hopper now when the armed services and the camps I have attended are handling the situation much better than the civilian authorities away from the camp handle it, and they have a way of handling the men in the camp. I have never seen anything administered any better than this situation administered in certain of the camps, the marine camps and so forth. I do not know how far overseas this would reach. I do not know how it would fit into the military set-up. I understand that the Canteen Act of 1901 is still in effect which regulates that and is Federal law. I hope we will not do anything here that will throw confusion into the present administration of the Army camps. They are progressing very well. I am not going to come down here and argue for the sale of liquor for nothing good can be said about it or for debauchery of the men, but I do feel it is very unwise to try to tinker with the internal workings of a military camp for which the commanding officer is responsible. If the internal workings of a camp, and if the personnel are not handled correctly, the proper thing to do is to change the commanding officer. I know this has some public appeal. As to the question of working on it, when we get to the so-called Universal Military Training Act, which I think will be some time next year instead of 6 months and 45 days from now, it will be wise for us to call up and get some advice from those who have been on the line and who have handled the situation. I think likewise the Committee on Education should be given a job to do with reference to working with and coordinating in the preparation of the so-called universal military training bill. I am reluctant to throw any more confusion into the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have enough confusion in America today. It is time for this House now to make up its mind to adopt the substitute I have offered, which is a straight outright draft bill, adopt it unanimously and let it go out to the people of America that at least the United States House of Representatives is in harmony and wants to promote harmony and is in accord on this very vital and immediately necessary piece of national defense legislation. I do hope that the gentleman will not prevail in this amendment. I understand it has been discussed before the Committee on Armed Services. I understand that the military men have seen some difficulties with this very problem, and so far as I am concerned I do not think we should on the spur of the moment take any ill-advised or on the spur-of-the-moment action on an apparently harmless looking amendment that might do us some harm. Let us see if we cannot keep this out. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's very high objectives. The gentleman is prompted by the highest motives, and so am I, but I am not so sure that this is not one of those things that looks so nice on the outside but may have a very disturbing and

a bad effect in the handling and the administration of the camps.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman calls attention that this might add to confusion. I agree with him that we have too much confusion in this country already, but it seems to me that this is one place where we can avoid a lot of confusion by just laying the thing on the line and then saying to the Secretary of Defense, "Now, you are the one who is to carry out these proposals."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say this. I do not think the gentleman is in possession of anything indicative of the fact that this provision is greatly needed. I have not been aware of any demand for this kind of legislation, and for that reason I do think that we had better settle down a little bit. I think to drag in this and to drag in the so-called universal military training that you are reaching ahead for trouble to bring in and wrestle with for the next year or two. Let us deal with the problems we now have confronting us. Let us let the American people at least settle back in their seats for a moment. I tell you they are worried, because they love their country.

Mr. REES of Kansas. With respect to the law of 1901, the difficulty with that is that we had a decision with regard to the Tax Act. They mixed the thing up with respect to what was intoxicating liquor.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not know what was on the books.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This will straighten that out.

Mr. BARDEN. I will pay my compliments to the commanding officers of the camps. They are doing a better job than we are doing as civilians on the outside, and they have the discipline, and they have the respect of the men in the camps. I am very reluctant to advocate that we attempt to reach inside of the gates of their camps and begin to go into the detailed management of the camps when no justification has been brought forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] to the Barden amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt that we are going to settle today or for many days to come the question of whether President Truman should fire General MacArthur or whether General MacArthur should fire President Truman. But we are going to settle today or tomorrow the question of this draft bill, and I rise in support of the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, had the vote on this bill been taken last November or December or even in January, when American forces in Korea were in dire peril, when there was fear that we would be thrown out of Korea with a loss of untold American lives, when we knew not where trouble would strike next, there would have been no question about the outcome of the vote on this bill. But today America is confident. The threat of a general war, America thinks, is over, at least for the moment, and when America is confident, America is complacent.

Now, what are the grounds for complacency? Are there grounds, Mr. Chairman, for complacency in Korea? At best we are only approaching a stalemate in Korea. We are not out of danger in Korea. At a cost of 58,000 casualties, we have driven the Reds out of South Korea, but they are still poised above the thirty-eighth parallel, possibly in greater strength than they have ever amassed before. That is all we have done in Korea.

Are there grounds for complacency in Western Europe? We have an alliance in Western Europe for our protection and their protection, but it is a paper alliance, an alliance in name only. We are but little stronger in fact at this moment in Western Europe than we were last June when the Reds struck in Korea.

Communism is a continuing effort, and for how long it will threaten no man can say. We have no agreement with Russia or China on peace. We do not even have an agreement that the foreign ministers can meet to talk of peace.

Then where are the grounds for complacency which would make it possible safely to water down this bill? Pass this bill and we may have some slight grounds for complacency, because we will be providing additional machinery for strength, and strength, Mr. Chairman, is the only thing that is heeded in world politics in this day.

I do not make idle talk. We have never before had half the world allied against us, and never before have we been so completely dependent upon our own strength for our security.

Mr. Chairman, approval of this bill, with what, of course, is an unprecedented proposal, a proposal for universal military training, may save, certainly it is going to help to save, many times 58,000 casualties in the years to come. I hope the committee will approve the bill as it now is before us.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of reluctance that I oppose the amendment offered by my own chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

There has been much effort of late by many people in and out of Congress to ridicule our military leaders. It has been an open season on the so-called brass. You see articles in Look magazine and in the Saturday Evening Post and other national magazines, endeavoring to tell the American people that the American soldier is an inferior soldier and that our military organization is not sufficient

for national defense. There is a great deal of concern, as I have noted in the debate on this manpower bill, by many Members of the House that by the passage of this legislation we will become a militaristic country, and that allowing military leaders to make military decisions, would eventually lead to a dictatorship. To be candid with you, I am not afraid one iota of this country becoming a military dictatorship. As a matter of fact, I do not agree with the statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] that if we pass this bill and had a five-star general in the White House, we should hang on to our hats. The events in recent hours have led me to believe that we would be much better off if we did have a five-star general in the White House. History has dramatically pointed out to us that it is not our military leaders who have fostered war upon us, but rather it is the people in the field of diplomacy who commit us to war without knowing the military significance of their actions. We can look at Korea as an example. We were committed to war in Korea not by our military leaders making a military decision, but we were committed to war in Korea because of a diplomatic decision reached by our so-called diplomats who had no comprehension of the military situation that they were getting us into. Yes, the diplomats put us into war in Korea without our being prepared for a military operation of that kind. The Secretary of State previously had stated Korea was out of our defense perimeter. The same Secretary of State prevailed upon the President and committed us to a military operation and then immediately threw the handcuffs and strait-jacket on our military leaders so that they could not win the war which they were committed to fight.

So I say to you I am not fearful of our military leaders making military decisions, but I am fearful of military decisions being made by our State Department following the lead of the British Government.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Would the gentleman agree with the statement made by Harold Ickes that "Wars are the result of stupid statesmanship"? I notice that Mr. Ickes did not say anything about stupid generalship. Does the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. POTTER. I agree with that statement. I certainly do.

Mr. Chairman, there has been much concern over the so-called universal military training features of this bill. I personally am sorry and regret that the committee did not bring us a universal military training bill. But I am going to support the committee's position, hoping that the committee will take the recommendations of this commission and then work its will within the committee and then allow the Congress to work its will to write a military training bill.

I am just old-fashioned enough to sincerely believe that citizenship requires, as one of its responsibilities, the

duty to be ready to defend our country when we are needed. That duty to defend your country does not apply to just a few of us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. Chairman, that does not mean that a few people, or a certain portion of our citizenship should be left out to take lucrative positions and then allow the poor boy and allow the boy without influence to do the fighting and assume the responsibility of the defense of his country for the entire group. Military training is a responsibility inherent upon each individual citizen. Because we are equal in citizenship it is the duty and responsibility of each individual to be trained in order to be in a position to defend his country when that defense is needed.

There are many things I would like to see carried out in our military program. If we adopt a program of universal military training, I am hopeful that if world conditions do not worsen we will be able to cut down our standing army. I am disappointed that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE] did not prevail. We cannot cut down the size of our standing army if we continue to send troops to every corner of the earth. It does no good to have troops for the Organized Reserves if you are going to have large forces of troops in being. So I hope that we will do everything possible to try to build up a large, strong reserve which will be the backbone of our military program, and which will allow us to keep our standing force at the very, very minimum. If that is not accomplished, then all this talk about a UMT program is of no avail.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he just stated it was his judgment that he would not hesitate to leave very grave and perplexing questions of diplomacy to military men. I understood him correctly?

Mr. POTTER. I said military questions.

Mr. JONAS. How does he reconcile that situation with the present dismissal of General MacArthur?

Mr. POTTER. I think it is one of the most tragic things that has happened to America. It is not General MacArthur whom I am concerned about, but it is the men who are fighting in Korea who have been stabbed in the back. Let me tell you why they were stabbed in the back. General MacArthur was relieved because he could not condone a military operation that had no declared objective—a policy to kill and be killed, with no declared objective. That is the present policy in Korea. General MacArthur in

an effort to carry out his military job of winning the war was dismissed. The men fighting in Korea are left with little hope that they will ever know for what they are fighting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] has expired.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say one or two words in support of the committee bill now pending. First of all, I would like to make it quite clear that I do not like a peacetime draft for UMT any more than some of the other Members. However, I feel that we have no choice, in view of world conditions. I might say that I was not in favor of the bill as originally offered, but I believe that the present bill, as amended, contains ample safeguards.

It has been suggested by some that should we adopt a policy of universal military training, such a step would lead toward war. It has been argued that universal military training in countries abroad did not prevent war. I think it might also be argued that the lack of universal military training did not prevent war.

Another objection to universal military training is that it would build up a military clique in this country which would be extremely damaging. Unfortunately, I cannot concur in that belief. Such might be possible if we had an extremely large Regular Establishment, but this particular bill is designed to make it possible to reduce our standing Army.

It has been suggested that with such forces under the control of the military that they, the military, would be anxious to employ them. I think such suggestions are entirely unwarranted, and I believe that any man, whether he be a professional soldier or not, who has seen the horrors of war, would do everything possible to prevent its recurrence. One fact that I think has been overlooked is that the Regulars also have sons who are subject to call. It is regrettable that world conditions are such that make this step necessary, but we must face the facts as they exist today. Let us have no wishful thinking or play upon intentions as far as Russia is concerned. As long as she is capable through her armed might of committing aggressive acts, we, in turn, must be capable of defending ourselves.

In conclusion, I might make my position clear. Should a bill eventually be presented which, in my judgment, is not sound, I will oppose it. To enact an unsound program of military training would give us a sense of false security.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Do I understand the gentleman from Maryland to say that he is for the bill known as S. 1?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I am.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And against the Barden amendment?

Mr. DEVEREUX. That is quite correct.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are five amendments at the

Clerk's desk. I am wondering if we can reach an agreement as to limitation of debate. I ask unanimous consent that debate on the Barden amendment and all amendments thereto close and that we have a vote at 4:30 o'clock. This would give ample time to dispose of all amendments that are on the desk and allow free debate on the Barden substitute. That would be an hour and 35 minutes from now that we would have a vote on the Barden substitute.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that is just the Barden substitute and the amendments to the substitute?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state the request. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on the Barden amendment and all amendments thereto close not later than 4:30 p. m.

Is there objection?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will those who wish to be heard stand in order that we may know how much time is needed?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask that debate close at 5 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on the Barden amendment and all amendments thereto close not later than 5 o'clock p. m.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, in view of the large number of Members standing can the Chair advise us how much time will be allotted to each?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can see how many Members are standing and he knows when 5 o'clock is.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for the pending bill and I intend to vote for universal military training, whether we vote on it separately or whether it is voted on in conjunction with the selective-service extension.

I am willing to stand up and be counted.

I have had some telegrams and letters—not many, just a handful—requesting that I support a separate vote on UMT. I have told these people I would support such a proposal because of my willingness to stand up and be counted on this particular issue. I may have to go back on my word to these correspondents, because I see the move to separate the two phases of this bill as a part of a move to defeat UMT. That, I believe, would be fatal.

Mr. Chairman, for a number of years I have felt that universal military training was absolutely necessary for the security of our Nation. I believe that until all threat of aggression is removed from the world we must have universal military training.

I do not hold with the argument that it is a step toward military rule in the United States. I know of no groups more opposed to military rule than the veterans of World War I and World War II. I believe that under UMT the trainees returning to civilian status, having lived under military discipline, will cherish the freedoms of civilian rule to a greater extent than those who have never experienced military discipline.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that my stand on this issue will not meet with the approval of a group whose support I have enjoyed through the years—the United Mine Workers of America. While I understand their position and their fear of military government, I believe, as I have already said, these fears to be unfounded.

I am pleased, however, to know that in supporting UMT, I shall be voicing the sentiments of the majority of voters in my congressional district. I am conducting a poll of public opinion. I have mailed questionnaires to every sixtieth name appearing on the voting lists in each of the seven counties comprising my district. My sampling hits the proper ratio of Republicans and Democrats in the district. When the questionnaires are all in, I shall make and present to the House a detailed tabulation of the results. But because of the pending legislation, I have had a running check made of answers to questions affecting military manpower.

Mr. Chairman, on the question "Do you favor universal military training," requiring a straight yes or no answer, as of this morning, with about three-fourths of the replies received, 81 percent of the voters in my district favor UMT.

That is an overwhelming percentage in favor. Only 13 percent have voted "no." Six percent either do not know or did not answer that particular question.

The preliminary, running tabulation, shows 74 percent of the voters favor an 18-year-old draft and 55 percent believe we require full mobilization.

Mr. Chairman, I believe these trends to be most significant.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the Members on both sides of the aisle, no matter what their views may be on the pending bill or any of the amendments thereto, for the very effective debate that has been engaged in to date, a debate that has been on the very highest level consistent with the great traditions of past Congresses.

Each and every one of us respects the views of other Members. The motives of no Member are impugned because, unlike legislative bodies of other countries where there is a powerful infiltration of Communists and Communist influence, each and every Member of the United States Congress, no matter how much they may disagree on this or that question, are over and above everything else loyal and true Americans. In our disagreement we disgrace as Americans. We have no individuals or groups having sinister thoughts, with responsibility to some foreign government the intent and purpose of which is to dominate the world and enslave all peoples if it can accomplish its objective.

The committee has worked hard under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia, one of our great Americans, not only of today but of his entire service in this body. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has brought here a bill that is the basis for consideration today. It has been a hard and a difficult task. The bill represents the best progress we can make at this time.

If I were to express any criticism, and I do not, I would say that the bill in relation to UMT, so far as I am concerned, does not go far enough. But that is no criticism. I am supporting the bill as reported by the committee and I shall support the bill as amended by the committee. The issue today will be the substitute offered by the very distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] to the committee bill as amended, the straight issue being whether or not we are going to have anything in the bill relating to UMT no matter how thin those provisions might be.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the sincerity of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] in offering his substitute, as I always do in any position he takes, though disagreeing with him in this instance. I hope his substitute will not be adopted.

To those Members who in theory are opposed to UMT, may I say that I recognize the thoughts that go through your minds, because the same thoughts have gone through my mind. I recognize the theoretical aspects and the theoretical considerations involved because I have had to give thought in my own mind for some years those influences and those considerations. To advocate the casting aside of those influences that exist in those Members' minds with just some sharp language would be unfair, because I am aware of those influences. I respectfully submit, having lived through the considerations that undoubtedly have entered your minds and which are in your minds now, yet retaining them in theory, you can justifiably vote to keep the UMT provisions in this bill, recognizing the practical situation that confronts us today. The law of self preservation is the first law of nature. It applies to nations the same as it applies to you and me as individual human beings. When sudden dangers confront us we have to respond to whatever it might be; not respond in the normal way, but in an abnormal way, and defense of our country is the primary duty of our Government.

I respectfully submit, my colleagues, viewing the world today and this question in the practical light that we should and must, and with all respect for my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BARDEN, and for his honesty in offering his amendment, that we should not take a chance today from a practical angle. We should reject his amendment and vote for the committee bill as amended, because that represents the strong side, psychologically important, in the world today.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin to the Barden amendment: Page 3,

line 22, after subsection (d) of section 1 insert a new subsection, as follows:

Paragraph 3 of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"No person shall be inducted for training and service under this title into any branch of the Armed Forces which restricts or limits the rights of its members to communicate directly with Members of Congress unless such communication is in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the Armed Forces."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the reading of the amendment makes its purpose clear.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Is it the purpose to permit any man who is inducted to sit down and take a pencil and paper and write to his Congressman or Senator?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. Is there anything now in the law that prohibits him from doing that?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There is. I was surprised to find out, and I was just going to say to the Members of the House, Mr. Chairman, that I never realized that there might be a need for such an amendment until just a couple of weeks ago. At that time a young sailor who was seeking a hardship discharge because of a situation which had arisen since his entry into the service had his family write to me in regard to the situation. In an attempt to investigate the facts I wrote back to the family and asked that they contact the son and have the son write me giving further details. They advised that he had been told by his commanding officer aboard ship that a direct communication with his Congressman was prohibited and it would make him subject to court-martial. I know that the regulation is not being enforced; I know that they overlook it many times, because you and I have received letters direct from members of the naval service. But the facts of the matter are that there should be no such prohibition; there should be no such regulation.

Mr. VINSON. The regulation that the gentleman has reference to is that no man in the armed services or in the Navy can write to a Congressman or a Senator with reference to legislation except through channels. It has no reference to writing anything about service. It is just to prohibit him from becoming a lobbyist, I might say, to influence Congress.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I admire the chairman of this committee and I acknowledge him as a great authority on the subject. However, I think in this instance he is laboring under the same impression that I have always labored under until I inquired into the subject and received a letter from the Department of the Navy dated March 13, 1951. I now quote one paragraph of that letter. I will seek permission when we go into the House to insert the whole letter, together with another letter which I received from the Army and also a letter from the Air Corps.

In this letter from the Department of the Navy dated March 13 there is this paragraph:

Accordingly, in the light of the above-quoted articles 1248 and 1249 it appears that any letter from a member of the naval service to Congress or to a Congressman which affects the Naval Establishment should be sent through official channels.

You will note that the regulations relate not just to communications dealing with legislation which affects the naval establishment, it covers communications concerning anything related to the Navy, and it requires that they be sent through official channels.

I will admit, Mr. Chairman, that there is no restriction on their right to send communications through channels, but anybody knows that that certainly is a restriction in and of itself.

I want to make it perfectly clear while I have the floor that no such regulations exist as far as the Air Force and the Army are concerned. They take what I think is a very reasonable attitude. But the Navy at the present time is not taking a reasonable attitude, and I use this occasion to point it out in the hope that it will correct the situation.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the gentleman that there is no induction in the Navy. However, I think the gentleman's amendment is all right, and as far as I am personally concerned I have no objection to it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman and under the circumstances I will not argue the point further. I would like, however, to include the letters from the Army, Navy, and Air Corps at this point.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 13, 1951.

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BYRNES: This is in reply to your letter of February 26, 1951, requesting an interpretation of articles 1248 and 1249, Navy Regulations (1948).

In an opinion dated April 7, 1950, the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with reference to articles 1248 and 1249, Navy Regulations (1948) stated in conclusion:

"The provisions of the above-quoted articles 1248 and 1249 would seem to be sufficiently broad to cover any communication intended or designed to influence Congress or a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriations affecting the Naval Establishment, whether pending, proposed, or suggested. Hence, in every case where a person in the naval service desires to send a communication to Congress, or a Member of Congress, the question to be answered by such person is whether his communication concerns legislation or appropriations relating to the Naval Establishment. Such a determination is made by the member of the naval forces at his own risk. If he has any doubt as to whether his proposed letter relates to the Naval Establishment, he should send it via the Secretary of the Navy.

"Accordingly, in the light of the above-quoted articles 1248 and 1249, it appears that any letter from a member of the naval service, to Congress or to a Congressman which affects the Naval Establishment, should be sent through official channels."

I consider this to be the correct interpretation of these articles. You will agree, I am sure, to the basic administrative policy

on which these articles are based: That the Department of the Navy should at all times be advised as to all matters relating to the Naval Establishment. These articles are not intended to prohibit correspondence between naval personnel and their Congressmen. Whenever correspondence addressed to a Congressman is sent via the Secretary of the Navy, it is, as a matter of policy, forwarded promptly.

Your inquiry in this regard is appreciated and your letter is being further referred to the Chief of Naval Operations for study of your suggestion that the articles might be clarified.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS P. MATTHEWS.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF
LEGISLATIVE LIAISON,

Washington 25, D. C., March 24, 1951.

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BYRNES: Reference is made to your letter to the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Frank Pace, Jr., wherein you ask if there are in existence any provisions which limit or restrict an officer or enlisted man from writing to Members of Congress or congressional committees. The Secretary of the Army has referred your letter to this office for appropriate action.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, there are no statutes by the Congress on such topic. The nearest approach thereto is contained in 50 United States Code 341, which, of course, is not directly in point.

The only Army regulation that has any relation to the subject inquired about appears to be Army regulations 600-10, paragraph 15, which, for your convenience, I quote, as follows:

"Legislative activities: Except as authorized by the Department of the Army, efforts by any person in the active military service of the United States or by any retired member of the Regular Army to procure or oppose or in any manner influence legislation affecting the Army Establishment or to procure personal favor through legislation, except to procure the enactment of private relief legislation, are forbidden. (Private relief legislation is legislation proposed or initiated by or on behalf of one individual for reimbursement or relief to himself or herself alone for damage or loss to his or her own person or property.)"

Arrangements have been made by the Army to provide ways and means of adjusting personal problems or grievances of individual soldiers. The company commander is required to be available for these purposes. The inspector general of every command will accept and look into complaints made by Army personnel. It is considered unnecessary for a man to feel he has to communicate with his Members of Congress in order to correct situations solely applicable to the military. However, as I have indicated, there are no regulations prohibiting such action, as it is felt it would be abridging the rights or privileges of a soldier as a citizen were he prevented from expressing his views to his elected Members of Congress.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated. I trust the information I have furnished is responsive to your inquiry and unambiguous on the issues discussed.

Sincerely yours,

C. G. BLAKENEY,
Colonel, GSC, Office; Chief of Legislative Liaison.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, March 26, 1951.

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BYRNES: I refer to your letter of March 17, addressed to Secretary Finletter,

regarding communications by servicemen with individuals outside the military service.

The Air Force has no policy or regulation prohibiting communication by its personnel with Members of Congress or other individuals not in the military service. In instances where a man is faced with a personal problem or some question concerning his military life, he is encouraged to seek the help and counsel of his commanding officer or others close at hand who can assist him, but his personal correspondence remains a matter entirely of his own choice.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. L. EATON,
Brigadier General, USAF, Director,
Legislation and Liaison.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY to the amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: Page 19, line 25, strike out the quotation marks and insert after line 19 the following new paragraphs:

"The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from active duty (1) of members of the inactive and volunteer reserves whose occupation, employment, or other activity is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest, and (2) of members of the inactive and volunteer reserves whose deferment is advisable by reason of the fact that other persons are dependent upon them for support. To the maximum extent practicable, deferments of such members shall be on the same basis as deferments under section 6 (h) of this title.

"The President is authorized to create and establish in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia, one or more civilian reserve deferment appeal boards (not within the Selective Service System). Each such board shall consist of five citizens of the United States who are not members of the Armed Forces, and who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Such boards shall function in the same manner and have the same powers, and the members of such boards shall receive the same compensation, as in the case of appeal boards within the Selective Service System.

"Any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve may, if his claim for deferment is denied at the time he is ordered into the inactive military or naval service of the United States pursuant to the first paragraph of this section, appeal to the civilian reserve deferment appeal board for the area within which he resides, and such board shall hear and determine his claim for deferment in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the President, pursuant to the second paragraph of this section. The decisions of such boards shall be final, except that any such decision shall be subject to modification or change by the highest reviewing body of the service concerned having authority (on appeal or otherwise) to hear and determine questions or claims with respect to the deferment from active duty of members of the inactive and volunteer reserve components of such service."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment, as is clear from the text, is to set up a civilian appeal board to which members of the inactive and volunteer reserves can appeal

when they are called into service. Their first appeal, of course, is to the particular service which calls them. At the present time they have no appeal outside that special service, so it is a question of the Army or the Navy making a determination. This is simply to give them the same rights as draftees have, namely, to have their case reviewed by a civilian appeal board.

I think we all know that if any group was inequitably and unjustly treated in the last 6 months it was the members of the inactive and volunteer reserves. This is simply to set up an appeal board to whom they can go for a review of their case. In other words, we give them the same rights that draftees have at the present time.

I think they should have more careful consideration. This simply proposes to give them the same rights of appeal as are currently given to draftees. This is restricted to the inactive and volunteer reservists.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. In view of the fact that the boys who are drafted under this act will have to remain in the reserves for a number of years following their service, I think the gentleman's amendment is particularly in order and very apt under the circumstances.

Mr. McCARTHY. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I presume the gentleman, as I have and probably every Member of Congress, has come in contact with some of the most heartbreaking cases that we have had. Such cases are much greater in number than arose under the draft. I refer to the indiscriminate calling of the inactive reservists, both enlisted men and officers and the terrific hardships and dislocations which have resulted to those men by reason of their being called back into active service.

Mr. McCARTHY. The gentleman is entirely right.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. May I point out that I have had exactly the same experience as my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota. I, too, have had cases of reservists who have been under the greatest pressure and who have had the greatest difficulty and their appeals have been based purely on a decision as to the military needs, without any cognizance being taken of their home or family situation. Their cases have been decided just the same as the draftees' cases have been decided.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would like to add that one of the chief naval personnel said, "We give consideration to these appeals." But they have no standards. They are given consideration. In other words, they may defer the man or they may not.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, it occurs to me, would have been very timely if it could have been on the statute books last summer when these situations began to arise.

I call the attention of the gentleman to a provision in the bill to require the military services to release these inactive people after 12 months of service. If that is eventually adopted, I am informally advised by one of the services that they will not call to active duty any of these inactive or volunteer reservists.

Mr. McCARTHY. I realize this comes late, but a great injustice has been done, and there is no assurance that the 12-month proposition will be enacted into law. I think this is necessary and I think it will help restore confidence in the reserve system which we need in this country.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman knows I have been very deeply interested in the proper handling of the reserve system. I have here a letter outlining a part of the program to be put into effect very shortly which I want to read into the RECORD when the gentleman has concluded addressing the committee.

I would like to ask him this question, however: This proposed amendment does not in fact turn over to the civilian board the matter of the release of reservists and give them full authority to work out a program of who should serve and who should not serve, does it?

Mr. McCARTHY. This commission would act only at the time the man was called up and under the same rules and regulations of the Selective Service Boards in the case of appeals of draftees. Once the man is in, this appeal board would have no authority over him.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it provides for the establishment of a board.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. May I call the attention of the gentleman, as well as the attention of the committee, to the fact that not long ago there were only 840 ad hoc boards in the Pentagon at one time. The gentleman now is seeking to make it 841 boards.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am seeking to create one in each State to take care of the problems of the inactive and volunteer reservists who have been treated unjustly, and those who may be treated unjustly.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from Georgia mentions that there were 840 ad hoc boards in the Pentagon. I should think the main ambition of the gentleman from Georgia would be to reduce that number so that more officers could be supplied for service.

Mr. VINSON. How can we do that when you adopt amendments and laws day after day to create more boards?

Mr. HINSHAW. The boards appointed at the Pentagon are appointed by the Military Establishment.

Mr. VINSON. Yes, but you have to have a law here which would create one more.

Mr. HINSHAW. No, these boards are appointed by the Military Establishment. This board would be appointed by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment not because I am unsympathetic to the problems which the gentleman has so ably presented to the committee.

I rise in opposition to it because I think he is moving at a late hour into a most complicated situation. I doubt whether it would be wise to set up, without careful consideration, boards and not know exactly what jurisdiction to give them. Such a board set-up would have the authority to decide what cases are to be deferrable and what are not deferrable. In effect, it would dispose of what is the policy of the Department of Defense, and what is the need of the Department of Defense, and all of those things.

So I rise at this time to read to you a letter. I think everybody will be interested in the letter, because it comes from the Department of Defense, setting up what this Department considers the present policy with reference to the recall of reservists. It is dated April 2, 1951.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Does that also contain a statement as to when some of these reserves called up will be released from active duty?

Mr. BROOKS. Partially. That is covered partially in the letter.

This letter is addressed to me:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1951.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: In answer to your inquiry regarding the calling of inactive reserves by the various services, the following are present policies:

The Army and Air Force are no longer calling inactive enlisted reserves to duty involuntarily and, unless there is a significant change in manpower requirements, no further recalls are contemplated. Nor are these services calling inactive officer reserves involuntarily except in those cases of men possessing special skills not available in the pool of Organized Reserves.

Organized naval reservists ordinarily are being ordered to active service before inactive naval reservists. However, the Navy must maintain minimum key officer and enlisted personnel in organized divisions in order to continue the training and administration of its Reserve program. Inactive reservists are ordered to active service only when the organized divisions have reached the lowest practicable manning level or when the men possess critical skills not available in the Organized Reserve.

The Marine Corps has called all ground Organized Reserves. All air Organized Re-

serve personnel, with the exception of 10 squadrons, have been called. Current plans provide for no further call up of Organized Air Reserves. Basically all inactive reserves, both ground and air, have been called to meet present plans. Only those few individuals whose specialties are required to fill specific billets will be called in the future.

The above policies do not affect orders already issued to inactive reservists.

In its presentation before your subcommittee, the Defense Department will cover:

1. Rotation plans of the services not already announced.

2. Phasing out programs and further recall policies respecting Reserves.

3. A long-range improved Defense Department Reserve program including the policy recommendations developed by the Civilian Components Policy Board.

As you can appreciate, the accomplishment and precise provisions of these plans and programs, and particularly of No. 3, will be dependent, to a large extent, upon the final form of the UMTS legislation and, naturally, at all times on the international situation.

As General Marshall has pointed out, our hopes and plans that we will not have to call back World War II veterans, and that we can reduce the size of the standing forces are dependent on the prompt adoption of long-range service and training legislation for the establishment of an enduring base of trained reserve manpower.

With kind regards,
Sincerely yours,

ANNA M. ROSENBERG.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Outlined in that letter, Mr. Chairman, is the program which will be presented to the Subcommittee on Reserve Components when it begins its hearings in the very near future; and that will give you some idea, if you care to study it, as to what the Department is presently trying to do with reference to the reservists.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I am very much disappointed that the Army and Navy are seeing fit to quit calling inactive reservists and also to cut draft calls and yet not to have a more optimistic program about the release of inactive reservists who are in exactly the same category.

Mr. BROOKS. I think if the gentleman will read the letters he will find that the Defense Department said that it understood the problem of Congress in reference to inactive reserves in service and that it wanted to proceed to release those inactive reserves at the earliest possible moment. When we put the stipulation which we presently have in the bill, I raised the point as to whether or not that would require an inactive reservist who is a veteran to serve 12 months or whether he could be released under that stipulation before his 12-month period expired and found on studying the provision that the inactive reservist can be released, if he is a veteran, before the 12-month period is up

if it is in the interest of national security to release him.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand the gentleman to say that if the provisions of the bill concerning the Reserve program as reported by the committee are adopted, within 12 months, by application an inactive reservist would be released from the service.

Mr. BROOKS. If he is a veteran, he has to come within the stipulation that he is a veteran.

Mr. HARRIS. That is true. I understand from the letter the gentleman has just read to the House that if this program as reported by the committee is adopted, according to the Defense Establishment itself and Mrs. Rosenberg's letter it will be the policy of the Department that they will not take in any more inactive reservists.

Mr. BROOKS. I would rather the gentleman read the letter himself. The gentleman has in fact read it.

Mr. HARRIS. I did read the letter, and I just ask the gentleman if I am correct in my understanding. The gentleman is a member of the committee and ought to be specific.

Mr. BROOKS. I am satisfied with that interpretation of it except in the Navy when the reservist has critical skills or when the organized division has reached the lowest practicable manning level.

May I say in conclusion that I am against the present amendment not because I am not in sympathy with it, but because we are attempting to legislate too rapidly on a most complicated subject.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I will support the Barden substitute for S. 1. It is my opinion that the Barden substitute is the only bill that should be passed as it seeks only to amend the Selective Service Act and eliminates the provision in S. 1 which deals with universal military training.

I said on the floor of the House a few days ago that in view of the amendments to the universal military training bill that it was no longer a training bill as the veterans' organizations have conceived such a program for many years. It would appear therefore, Mr. Chairman, that we should legislate only on amendments to the Selective Service Act and I favor the Barden substitute as it provides for the induction of boys of 19 rather than 18½ years as contained in S. 1.

Mr. Chairman, we have now been debating this bill for more than a week. We have listened to a great deal of able argument for and against the pending measure. The views expressed have made for a solid understanding as to just what is proposed in the measure before us. I have not as yet, however, heard any argument which would indi-

cate that there is something more to the legislation than merely the amendment of a Selective Service Training Act or a program of universal military training.

Mr. Chairman, it should be clearly understood by all Members of this House that the military is merely an arm of foreign policy. Soldiers do not move unless in support of our foreign policies. Today that is the basic issue between General MacArthur and President Truman. The President has charged that the supreme commander in Tokyo has failed to support his foreign policies. So in considering the bill before us let it be understood that what we are actually doing is to support a bill which would induct untold millions of our American boys for purposes of combat to assist the Truman foreign policies which have been dismal and tragic failures. This legislation would impress young Americans into military service all over the world as it is doing today in Korea. Is that what Members of this House want? Is this what your constituents want? If you will think seriously on this point, I believe many of you will vote to support the Barden substitute rather than S. 1 which is sponsored by the Armed Services Committee of this House.

Mr. Chairman, last night Mr. Truman addressed the American people and he endeavored to explain his position regarding the dismissal of General MacArthur from his command in Tokyo where he has done a marvelous job. He can never justify such action. Members of this House will recall that when the fighting in Korea broke out last June that Chiang Kai-shek offered to send a force of 35,000 trained fighting men to assist in holding the drive of the North Koreans. This offer was turned down by direction of President Truman and Secretary Acheson. Is it not strange that we would not accept the offer of Chiang Kai-shek to send his men? The administration saw fit to insist that American boys be sacrificed in this undeclared and terrible war in Korea and there are 70,000 casualties as of today; 9,000 of our boys have died in battle.

Mr. Chairman, there is one more point I want to stress, which is that it seems to me that our foreign policy is being dictated by the British Government. Was it not strange that on yesterday when the American people were aroused to a fighting pitch by the President's unthinkable action that the people in France and Britain were actually rejoicing and for what, I ask you? Foreign Minister Herbert Morrison had the gall to suggest when MacArthur's firing was known that the United Nations now invite the Chinese Communists to help write a peace treaty with Japan; that we now surrender Formosa to the Communists and that we negotiate peace immediately with the Chinese Communists in Korea. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFFER] has just pointed out to the House in a news article and editorial today from the Communist Daily Worker which is parallel to the demands made by Mr. Morrison. This is nerve beyond description.

Mr. Chairman, so long as Dean Acheson is Secretary of State the British for-

eign office will write American foreign policy. The time has come and much too late for the President of the United States to demand his resignation in the interest of national unity.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I have a lot of boys in my district who enlisted a month or so ago. They are going to be called up in June. There is no room for these boys, yet they will not let these reservists out. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. No; I do not.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Like the gentleman from Minnesota, the sponsor of the amendment, I am very sympathetic to the cause of the reservist who is on active duty, and especially the inactive and volunteer reserve who has been called up. In considering the problem of a reservist who has been called to active duty it is well to keep in mind this point. When the reservist joined the Reserves of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps he signed his name to an application and in doing so he agreed to abide by certain rules and regulations that he understood before he affixed his signature.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question at that point on that particular matter?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Not at the moment; I will yield later on.

The Armed Services Committee has considered this Reserve problem for many, many weeks, along with this UMT bill. We have written into this bill provisions that are designed to provide relief for the reservists. In addition to the relief provided in this bill, should it become a law, there is in existence special boards composed of officers, including reserves, created for the purpose of considering applications for deferment or for hardship discharge.

The membership of these boards includes married officers with children thus giving them an insight to actual conditions in the average home. Therefore, it is proper to say that every application for a deferment or a hardship discharge is assured proper consideration. I have appeared before several of these boards in behalf of my constituents. I must say I have always been given a just hearing and where the evidence was of merit a favorable decision was rendered.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. How does it come that the gentleman can appear as a Member of Congress before a board like that whereas other Members of Congress are denied the right to appear before such boards?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. My statement is based on my own experience. I made a request to appear before such boards and have never been refused.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, and serving on one of the

subcommittees headed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks], may I say that we are about to give consideration to the entire Reserve program. One of the subjects to be considered is the future treatment of reserves. Knowing what I do about the report to be submitted by the Department of Defense I can say that many of the problems affecting the reserves of this country will be taken care of and we will recommend in the near future a Reserve program that will tell the reserve far in advance of his date of call just what his classification is, when he will be called, whether he can be deferred and how long he will serve and so forth.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has referred to the reservist as one who signs his name and going into the Reserves. Has the gentleman recognized that in this bill he will involuntarily perhaps be in the Reserves for some 6 years after his 26 months of service?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct and that is one of the reasons why I am for the bill. It furnishes a reservoir of trained manpower for any emergency.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. One member of the committee says I am too late in offering my amendment. It seems now, from the gentleman's remark, that I am too early. May I suggest that this may be the right time to consider the problem.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I hesitate to encourage the approval of the gentleman's amendment because I think the subject should be given a lot of consideration by the Brooks subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee in considering the entire Reserve program for the future.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman is a hard-working member of that subcommittee. He realizes that it is a very difficult problem and a complicated subject. Further, the gentleman has confidence in the subcommittee and realizes we are going to go into the matter and do our best to iron out inequities and injustices.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is exactly right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the McCarthy amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, it is quite possible that this is not the right time to consider the particular amendment that is pending and even if it were adopted as an amendment to the Barden bill and the Barden substitute not agreed to, it would not have any effect at all. However, may I say, particularly to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, when he talks about the reservist who has signed his name and joined the Reserve and is a good American citizen as such, then he gets called in, that of course he knew what he promised when he signed his name, but years later when he finds himself in a difficult spot he cannot resign. Here we have a case where you are going to take about seven, eight, or nine hundred thousand men a year or every 6 months or whatever the time is and put them in the Reserves involuntarily for 6 years, under the UMT program. Now that is not what you might call voluntary service in the Reserves.

Furthermore, times change after men are released from training or service, and I feel very strongly as one Member of this Congress that the best people to decide upon deferment from call to active duty are those who are closest to the situation, just as we have those questions today brought before our local draft boards and local appeal boards. I think the situation is going to be different when we adopt the UMT program, for example, than it is now. It will be very different indeed, and I hope the gentleman will recognize that fact and not confine his thinking to the situation as it has existed heretofore.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Under the UMT program we are to be provided with a reservoir of trained men in time of an emergency.

Mr. HINSHAW. Partly trained.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. They can do a pretty good job in 6 months. Now, why should we give a preference to this reservoir of trained men and not the man who volunteers for the Regular service?

Mr. HINSHAW. There is a difference between a volunteer and one not volunteering. If a man volunteers for the Regular service or to stay in the Reserve, and fills a niche, then that is his own personal voluntary action. This other action is not a voluntary action, and since it is not voluntary action, it should be considered differently. Many men enjoy military service as a career.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Am I not correct when I say that the responsibility of defending this country in time of war is a responsibility which belongs to everybody?

Mr. HINSHAW. Oh, of course, nobody denies that. And, I could wave the flag myself when it comes down to that. I served in the Army of the United States just like a great many other Members of this Congress, and perhaps without the great distinction the gentleman from Pennsylvania achieved. Nevertheless, I served and I know fully what the situation is, and I understand too the situation of the people back home who are

the relatives and dependents of these reservists and who suffer hardship on occasion because of some of these brass-hat boards that the gentleman can get in to see that the rest of us cannot get in to see and who refuse to listen to the pleas of these men for hardship deferment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I think the greatest injustice that has been done to any group of people in this country has been done to the reservists. I believe something has to be done to rectify this situation now. I put that responsibility right on the Committee on Armed Services. They must do something about it; they should have done something about it months and months ago, and they cannot answer me as to why they have not.

I want to give you one example. A member of the inactive Reserve of the Health Department in the eastern part of West Virginia was called into the service and the Navy would not release him, the West Virginia Department of Health said it would take 6 months to train somebody to take his place and get acquainted with the territory. I appealed to the Navy Department to release him from active duty, because they have hundreds and hundreds of draftees that could be called, but they refused. Another instance, one boy who was also a member of the inactive Reserve was called back into the service and after 6 months, he wrote home and said all he had done during that time was answer muster in the morning. Day before yesterday a boy was in my office who was proceeding on orders to the Pacific. He is 38 years old with 2 children, and he also was in the inactive Reserves. He said a Navy commander came to his home to get him to sign up for the Reserves, and at that time told him the active Reserves would be called first in an emergency and that the draftees of the same age limit as he with the same number of dependents would be called next. These are the facts, and he is willing to make affidavit. Again, I say that this committee is the committee that should have straightened out the reservist material situation of this country. I think it is too late now. Furthermore, one boy told me that he was called into service as a reservist and that he was not given a physical examination. He is now in the Navy and has not yet been given a physical examination, yet he is on his way to the Pacific. In my home town of all the reservists called to active duty not one has been in the active Reserve Corps.

If the gentlemen of the committee can explain away these facts I would like to see it done. Also, the fact of why they haven't proceeded to clear up this terrific injustice to the Reserves.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] to the Barden amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL to the amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 19, line 25, insert a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. All persons included within the scope of this act shall be entitled to vote regardless of age."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order to give me an opportunity to discuss it?

Mr. VINSON. I reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I assure the committee that I would not have pressed so hard for this amendment here today had not somebody blown down my neck a little while ago and said, "Withdraw your amendment. It is too tough an issue for this House to decide."

If it has come to the point where we cannot decide whether or not we ought to let the boys we are drafting under this bill vote, the boys of 18 years of age, and the boys regardless of age who are in the service, then I think we had better forget the whole business, because this issue goes hand in hand with the drafting of these boys. If they are old enough to fight they are old enough to vote.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. If a man is too old to fight he is too old to vote; is that right?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The answer to that is that a man is never too old to fight.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman's amendment apply to the WAVES and WACS?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the gentleman heard my amendment being read, which I am sure he did, I believe it mentioned "persons," so I presume it would apply to both sexes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That would be the gentleman's congressional interpretation of his amendment?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That would certainly be my interpretation of it.

It does not seem to me as though it would take very much courage on the part of any one of us, since we are going to draft these boys into the armed services, to give them an opportunity to vote. In some States they vote at 18 and in other States they do not. However, I think we can at least make this concession to the young persons in the service, and they should have an opportunity to vote regardless of age.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I cannot believe the gentleman would say here on the floor of this House that because he proposes an amendment that is not germane to the bill the Members of this House do not have the courage to vote on the issue regardless of what it is. Does the gentleman mean that?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I know what the gentleman is trying to imply, but if he will follow what I am saying—

Mr. HARRIS. I am following what the gentleman is saying. The gentleman said the Members do not have the courage to vote on the issue.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I said nothing about my amendment's being ruled out of order and made no implication as to the chairman of the committee attempting to have my amendment ruled out of order because the House might be afraid to face this issue. What I referred to was the incident that occurred in the cloakroom, when, as I said a while ago, somebody blew down my neck and insinuated that they wanted me to withdraw this amendment because it was too tough an issue for them to face.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Does not the gentleman realize that whatever is said in the cloakroom is privileged?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I simply want to set my good friend from Arkansas, a splendid gentleman, straight on the matter. I did not in any way imply that any member of the committee or any Member of the House in attempting to rule my amendment out of order was afraid to face the issue.

But I will say that the one who buttholed me in the cloak room apparently was afraid to face the issue.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I am sure the gentleman who made that statement to the distinguished gentleman who is now addressing us was a stranger because we all know the gentleman from New York as a man of great courage.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does not the gentleman realize that many of his colleagues are just a little bit, maybe not too little, but are just envious and jealous of the position the gentleman from New York has attained in his own district among his constituents?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Time will tell. I appreciate the gentleman's generosity anyway.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment ought to be adopted. I am sorry to see the gentleman from Georgia make a point of order against it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from New York has offered an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk. The gentleman from Georgia makes a

point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the pending bill. The Chair invites attention to the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York deals with a subject matter which is not dealt with in the pending bill nor by the act which the pending bill seeks to amend. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York embraces a subject matter coming under the jurisdiction of another standing committee of the House and would seek to affect legislation which has been enacted, having been reported by another standing committee of the House and which does not come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services which has reported the pending bill.

Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the amendment which the Chair has just ruled out of order, in the discussion with reference to it, a possible inference has been created involving the integrity of every Member of the House. I ask unanimous consent that the committee may pass upon the amendment irrespective of the fact that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not want to be included with the rest of the Members of the House. You just leave me out of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARRIS) there were—ayes 0, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] have the right to appeal from the decision of the Chair in this instance?

The CHAIRMAN. He would have had that right, but it may be a little late now.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. I would like to request to be advised how many amendments are now pending at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised there is one other amendment, proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. VINSON. May it be presented at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to offer his amendment at this time?

Mr. TEAGUE. I offer the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE to the amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: Page 20, after line 18, add a new section, as follows:

"That members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force entitled to receive basic pay shall in addition thereto be entitled to receive a special pay at the monthly rate of \$100 per month for officers and \$75 per month for enlisted persons for combat duty while actually engaged in combat, or in direct combat support of actual combat forces: *Provided*, That this special pay shall be included in the computation of any death gratuity or benefit payable as a result of the death of such member while entitled to such special pay.

"(b) Combat duty, for the purpose of this section, is duty for a period of at least 6 days in any calendar month in opposition to a hostile force, including guerrillas, performed under such circumstances as may be prescribed in regulations by the Secretaries concerned, subject to approval of the Secretary of Defense, which regulations shall be uniform as far as practicable: *Provided*, That if the member is killed or injured as a result of having been actually engaged in combat or in direct combat support of forces actually in combat, the requirement that he perform such duties for the period of at least 6 days shall not be applicable.

"(c) No person shall be eligible to receive the special pay provided by this section if authorized to receive any incentive or special pay pursuant to sections 203, 204, or 205 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 809).

"Sec. 2. This act shall be effective from and after June 27, 1950, and no pay provided herein shall accrue to any person for any prior periods."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane, as it relates to combat pay, and there is nothing in this bill or the original Draft Act of 1948 dealing with the question of pay or combat pay at all.

I will reserve the point of order if the gentleman desires me to do so.

Mr. TEAGUE. If you will please.

Mr. VINSON. I reserve a point of order against the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] is recognized.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, some 8 months ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] and myself offered a bill giving our soldiers in Korea combat pay. The Defense Department announced it had sent a bill over, which I presume will be introduced by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. This bill I am offering gives recognition to those members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force who do not draw hazardous duty pay or special pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, but who are actually engaged in combat and suffer the extreme hazards that accompany that type of service. Those men in our Armed Forces who are already drawing some kind of special or hazardous duty pay, such as for flying, submarine, glider, paratroop, demolition, and deep-sea diving duty, will not receive this extra compensation since they are already getting some form of recognition for the risk involved. To be eligible to receive special pay for combat duty under this bill, a man must be actually engaged in combat or direct support of the troops actually in combat for

at least 6 days a month. However, if a man were killed or injured in combat before the 6-day period expired, he would still be eligible for combat pay under this bill. The extra pay, under such conditions, would be \$75 per month for an enlisted person and \$100 per month for an officer, and would be computed into any death gratuity or benefit. The bill would make the combat pay retroactive to June 27, 1950, the beginning of the Korean hostilities.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Did this include engineers and the Signal Corps?

Mr. TEAGUE. Every man in the Army, the Air Force, or the Navy who is in a combat area and is not already receiving some kind of hazardous duty or special pay.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. So that the committee can clearly understand it, it means combat pay for those engaged in combat with the enemy.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct. Those actually and actively in combat with the enemy and subject to becoming a casualty from enemy action.

Mr. VINSON. A bill of that character is now pending in the Senate Armed Services Committee?

Mr. TEAGUE. There is one pending in the House, but I do not know how long it is going to remain pending.

Mr. VINSON. I might also state that there is one pending before the Armed Services Committee of the House.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell me why the differential in pay between officers and enlisted men for combat duty?

Mr. TEAGUE. Well, that is a long discussion. Will you tell me why there is a difference in your pay and the pay of the girl who works in your office?

Mr. GROSS. I am not being shot at, but a person who is shot is just as dead whether he be an enlisted man or an officer.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is true and in neither case would any amount of money compensate any enlisted man, officer, or their family for the death of the man himself. On the other hand, there is a difference in responsibility which is pretty generally recognized in every branch of civilian life regardless of where you go. The Defense Department bill suggested that officers receive \$100 and enlisted men, only \$50; I changed it to \$100 and \$75. Further than that, under the present Career Compensation Act of 1949, officers receive hazardous-duty pay for flying and submarine duty which ranges from \$210 to \$100 per month while, for the same duty, enlisted men receive only \$75 to \$30 per month. The amounts which would be paid under this bill narrow the gap considerably. In the final analysis, I don't believe that a bullet will make a distinction between an enlisted man or officer, but I do believe that the weight of responsibility

for looking out after the lives of 50 to possibly 800 men is something that deserves a small bit of consideration in the matter.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. It is a fact, is it not, that right now in the Senate a hearing is taking place on the bill? As a matter of fact, it has been sent to the committee by the Department. It is being sponsored by General Collins. In an interview with General Collins a few days ago I stated to him that just as soon as we could get around to it I was going to ask the Committee on Armed Services to take the matter up and give it consideration. It does deserve consideration, and I will assure the gentleman that it will receive consideration. General Collins thinks it is very meritorious. It is being considered now in the Senate committee and will be heard by the Armed Services Committee just as soon as we can get around to it which I hope will be in a short time.

Mr. TEAGUE. I thank the chairman. To me it is the greatest injustice that is being done in our military service. For example, in Korea today, as of March 31, 1951, we had 9,865 deaths, of which 8,138 were Army, 1,485 were in the Marine Corps which would be covered by this bill; 156 were in the Air Corps, and 86 in the Navy.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There is a good deal to be done for the disabled men who have come out of the Korean war that has not been done yet.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is true. There is a good deal that could be done for men while they are actually in combat and, certainly, if they are permanently disabled as a result of combat action.

Now, I would just like to look at the matter as it stands today. Who gets the extra pay today for hazardous duty? According to the Career Compensation Act of 1949, recognition is given for flying and submarine duty on the following basis: Officers receive from \$210 to \$100 extra pay per month and enlisted men from \$75 to \$30, dependent upon grade or rank. By the same token, members of the Armed Forces who are assigned to paratroop, glider, demolition, submarine escape training, deep sea diving, experimental diving, or frequent flying—not as a crew member—duty are compensated for the risk with \$100 extra pay per month if an officer, or \$50 per month if an enlisted man. This does not cover the average combat soldier of the infantry or Marine Corps who are actually the ones who take the greatest casualties. The infantryman or Marine gets no recognition like this for fighting and dying under the worst possible conditions. During World War II, as a matter of fact, the holder of the Combat Infantryman's Badge received \$10 extra pay per month; but in the Korean war not even that recognition has been accorded him.

But who takes the greatest casualties during combat and hence operates under the most hazardous conditions? As of March 31, 1951, the United States had

suffered 58,550 casualties in the Korean hostilities, of which 48,673, or 83 percent, were in the Army, 8,794 in the Marine Corps, 633 in the Navy, and 450 in the Air Force. Due to the fact that strength figures of the various services of the Armed Forces in Korea are classified information, no comparison on a percentage basis can be made. Hence, let us turn back to World War II to obtain such a comparison.

In the Army, which then included the Air Force, there were a total of 10,420,000 men in service, of which 948,574 became casualties, that is, were killed in action, wounded in action, missing in action, died of wounds, or died as a prisoner of war. These casualties were distributed as follows:

| Branch of Army | Percent of strength of Army in all theaters | Percent of cumulative casualties suffered in all theaters |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Ground forces..... | 34.9 | 79.8 |
| Air Force..... | 15.5 | 12.3 |
| Service troops..... | 49.6 | 7.9 |

It can be easily seen that the Ground Forces suffered a highly disproportionate percentage of the casualties when compared on a relative strength basis. To carry the matter further, of the Ground Force casualties, 67.8 percent were in Infantry divisions; of the Infantry division casualties, 94.25 percent were in Infantry regiments. Thus, we have the Infantry, which comprised only 20.5 percent of the total strength overseas, taking 70 percent of the total casualties. I think that demonstrates rather conclusively where the extreme hazard exists. If not, then I offer this fact. In World War II, the average number of casualties for all Infantry divisions who engaged in combat was 9,505 per division. That is about a 100-percent turnover of the purely Infantry strength of a division when you consider that the strength of an Infantry regiment was about 3,200; that there are only three Infantry regiments in a division; and that the average of 9,505 includes the divisions that saw little combat, such as those committed in the spring of 1945. Without attempting to detract one iota from men on submarine duty, it is noteworthy that Commander Charles B. Carroll, a noted submarine skipper of World War II, has stated that the casualty rate among submarine personnel was only 18 percent.

How much did the infantryman get paid for taking this risk as compared to other branches of the Army and Armed Forces? The average pay of enlisted men in the various branches of the Army in 1943 was as follows:

| Branch: | Average annual pay |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Air Force..... | \$1,152 |
| Ordnance..... | 875 |
| Signal Corps..... | 780 |
| Armored Force..... | 760 |
| Quartermaster..... | 750 |
| Antiaircraft Artillery..... | 730 |
| Field Artillery..... | 730 |
| Engineers..... | 720 |
| Medical..... | 707 |
| Infantry..... | 700 |

¹ Exclusive of flying pay.

Later, grades and ratings were added which increased the pay for the infantry to \$743, but the ratio remained unequal since the other branches were increased also. The comparison of the average monthly pay of enlisted men on hazardous duty during World War II is just as revealing:

| Type of unit | Average monthly pay | Average monthly pay including all extra compensation |
|----------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Infantry rifle company.... | \$92 | \$120 |
| Combat crew: | | |
| Aircraft..... | 112 | 201 |
| Submarine..... | 102 | 153 |
| Parachute rifle company.. | | 170 |

There is little doubt that the infantryman was extremely low paid, comparatively speaking, but how about recognition in the form of awards and decorations? The following is a comparison between various services of the Armed Forces in World War II based on the ratio of men killed to the number of decorations awarded:

| Branch of service | Total awards | Total killed | Awards per man killed |
|------------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| All Army divisions.... | 358,366 | 144,160 | 2.5 |
| Air Force..... | 1,307,105 | 31,956 | 40.9 |
| Navy..... | 149,223 | 37,079 | 4.0 |
| Marine Corps..... | 53,100 | 19,637 | 2.7 |
| Coast Guard..... | 1,663 | 585 | 2.8 |

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at this time that I am certainly not trying to detract from the men in the other services or branches of the Armed Forces. They serve and they die as well as infantrymen. What I am trying to point out is the extreme disparity between the pay of the infantryman, and I include the ground force of the Marine Corps in this category too, and the pay of other branches when it is actually the infantryman and the marine who take the brunt of our casualties and who live and die under conditions that no other person in the service is forced to endure. If anybody deserves hazardous duty pay, I feel that these men do. The least we can do is to try, any way that we can, to let them know that we appreciate and recognize what they are going through for all of us.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TEAGUE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has offered an amendment. The gentleman from Georgia has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the pending bill.

The Chair invites attention to the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas covers a subject matter which is not covered in the pending bill or in the act which is sought to be amended by the pending bill.

The Chair is of the opinion therefore that the amendment is not germane to the pending bill and sustains the point of order.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY to the amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 7, line 25, after the period add a new paragraph (j) and the following:

"Said paragraph (1) is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'No physician or dentist who is engaged in full-time employment as such at any hospital operated by the Veterans' Administration shall be inducted under the provisions of this subsection after he has attained the thirtieth anniversary of the date of his birth.'"

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment, although I have not had an opportunity to study it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have proposed is refreshing in that it does not deal with a controversial section of this legislation that has torn the House during the past 3 days of debate. It is a humanitarian appeal to my colleagues to act now to handle a serious situation—an appalling situation—that has developed in the veterans' hospitals of our Nation.

At the present time there are 146 hospitals in operation in the country. As of January 15, 1951, they were short 379 doctors, members of their medical staffs, to bring them up to the normal complement. Since the 15th of January there have been 6 additional veterans' hospitals completed requiring 55 doctors and only 4 of those hospitals have been able to open their doors because they have no medical staff.

Let me say, in addition, that there are 21 new hospitals to be completed prior to the 1st day of January 1952, which will require a total of 460 doctors on the medical staffs. There is not a doctor in sight for any of them.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we can justify this situation from an economic standpoint. The four that cannot go into operation plus the 21 to be completed before January 1, 1952, will cost about \$317,000,000. I am wondering if we can justify their standing idle during the months we are waiting for doctors to fill the medical staffs and thousands of veterans are pleading for admission to the hospitals.

Mr. Chairman, that is not all. The armed services are raiding the medical staffs and the dental and nursing staffs of your veterans' hospitals. Of the 4,000 doctors employed in veterans' hospitals today, 2,040 are reservists; 418 of those reservists have been called to active service, including 136 specialists. They are calling now for an additional 270 doctors which they will separate in the matter of a few weeks or months at most. It is a desperate situation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Veterans' Administration is begging for assistance. The situation is even worse than it was in World War II. They will accept almost anything to get doctors. I understand they are in favor of the gentleman's amendment or a provision

that I put in and that other Members have offered.

Mr. BAILEY. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I am sure if this amendment fails I shall join her in her effort to get some medical staffs for our veterans' hospitals.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that this situation is really desperate. I could if time would permit read into the Record here in support of my amendment a statement from Maj. Gen. Carl Gray, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, pointing out the real seriousness of this situation. Let me appeal to you, if you are a veteran, please come to the rescue of the servicemen who need treatment in these hospitals. You may be the father or the mother of a veteran who needs treatment in these hospitals. Here is an opportunity, a simple approach to the situation.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that a certain number of the younger medical men who were trained at Government expense have an obligation they should carry out by serving in the armed services. We also have legislation on the statute books requiring the registration of doctors between the ages of 25 and 50 years. In between the ages of 30 and 50 we hope to get some medical men who will fill up the staffs of these veteran hospitals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, all my amendment does is just this simple proposition, that we exempt from the terms of this legislation reservists who have reached their 31st birthday or other doctors subject to draft under public law passed by the Eighty-first Congress if they are above 30 years of age.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. As I understand it, there are now over 4,000 doctors with the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. BAILEY. Two thousand and forty to be correct.

Mr. CHELF. Two thousand and forty of the four thousand are in the Reserves.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. CHELF. Four hundred thirteen have already been called?

Mr. BAILEY. Four hundred eighteen have been called and they are calling for nearly 300 more.

Mr. CHELF. I think I will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BRYSON. Is it not a fact there are numerous veterans incarcerated in county jails by reason of the fact they cannot be admitted into veterans' hospitals?

Mr. BAILEY. That is true. I hope the members of the Armed Services Committee will not object to this amendment. I do not believe the point of germaneness should be raised and I do not believe it rests against this amendment. In any event, I sincerely hope no member of the committee will oppose it because it has a humanitarian objective, not political or military.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have examined the gentleman's amendment, and I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Let me again plead with the Members to give this matter very serious consideration. Here is an opportunity to do a real service.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I think the committee is well aware of the difficulties that face not only the Veterans' Administration, but the civilian population and the services. Under the present Doctors Act which we passed some time ago the President, by Executive order, can do exactly what the gentleman's amendment will do; therefore, I hope the committee will oppose the amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. That is not true according to the statement by General Gray. They take their chances just like any independent hospital in getting doctors at the present time.

Mr. DURHAM. A provision is written in there and he certainly can do it by Executive order.

Mr. BAILEY. I will say that I not only have the support of the Veterans' Administration, but I have the support of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. They say it is a worthy project and there is no reason why this House should not act on it at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, whether the President has the authority to act or not, he certainly has not acted. I remember in World War II they said the President had the authority to act to give them military status. He finally did act, but it was long after the need that he finally acted. We have lost men because we did not have enough doctors to take care of them. They were given military status.

We talk about giving the service men more pay while they are serving. Let us take care of them when they are discharged. A good many veterans in hospitals who were discharged under the retirement act did not get retirement pay. To date the Armed Services Committee has done nothing to rectify that mistake. The least we can do is to give them medical attention in order that they can get well after they come out. I hope the amendment will be adopted. I do not believe any Member here will regret it, and I think it is a very necessary amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the gentleman please make it plain to the members of the committee that this amendment does not apply unless those men are full-time employees of the staff of a veterans' hospital.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, that is exactly what I have been told. I talked to the Veterans' Administration twice on the matter and they favor this and are very anxious for it; in fact, they have pleaded with me, which was not necessary, to try to secure more doctors for them. This amendment is one way to do it. Another way to do it is by giving them military status by legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] to the Barden amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Barden amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock, with 5 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] and 5 minutes for the committee to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as a large number of Members have indicated they would like to speak on the Barden amendment, in order to give each of them an adequate amount of time, since I think this is the most far-reaching bill this Congress will consider this session, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended one-half hour.

Mr. TACKETT. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

(Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. LANTAFF.)

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, universal military training is the base upon which a permanent national defense program in a democracy must be built today. We all know that total warfare of the modern type can descend on a nation overnight. That means, of course, we no longer have time to train massive military forces after the war begins or the emergency declares itself. The only answer, outside of a monstrous standing military force, is for citizen military training to become the duty of every male at some time in his life. In that way a large pool of men trained in the military ABC's is brought in being from which the Reserve forces may draw their strength; and then, in turn, the standing forces may turn to an adequate Reserve in time of emergency. In short,

universal military training is a long-range program of military insurance for peace and security; and, I do not believe that such training, when properly conducted, breeds militarism or war any more than a life-insurance policy brings on sickness or death.

Yet, to admit the wisdom of universal military training is not enough. I believe that there are certain basic principles which any universal military training program must follow in order to succeed in the United States and still perform the job for which it is intended:

First, the program must be on a permanent, long-range basis. In order to satisfy this requirement, it must find a middle ground which takes into account these factors: (i) It must retain the approval of the Nation—particularly the parents—in times of peace as well as emergency; (ii) it must provide adequate training to bring the trainee up to the minimum level required by our Reserve forces; and, (iii) it must fit in as much as possible with the normal course of the individual trainee's life.

Secondly, the program must be democratic, that is, as universal as possible in its application.

Thirdly, the program must be predominantly a civilian effort, that is, the civilian must have a vital and controlling influence in its operation although the military provide the training. I believe that H. R. 3553, the bill which I have introduced on this subject, fully outlines a universal military training program which will satisfy these essentials.

Since George Washington's day, universal military training has been discussed in one form and another. Just in the last 10 years, there have been commissions appointed to study the subject; exhaustive hearings have been held in both the House and Senate; and numerous bills have been offered on both sides of Congress on universal military training. Just reading the material on this subject will keep any Member quite busy for several months. I believe that there is enough in this past discussion that we should be able to formulate a clear and definite universal military training program. For instance, the Compton Commission, after an exhaustive study of universal military training, submitted a report to the President in May 1947. Shortly thereafter—in July 1947—the Towe bill—H. R. 4278, Eightieth Congress—was introduced after hearings before the House Committee on Armed Services. The Towe bill was a concrete, detailed presentation of a universal military training program based substantially on the Compton Commission report and recommendations. The Towe bill evolved, ultimately, after further study—particularly by the American Legion—into the Russell bill which was introduced into the Senate as the first universal military training bill in 1951, and is the basis of the bill—H. R. 3558—which I have before the Congress. So, actually, the universal military training program which I am advocating is the end result of many, many people's thinking and several years of endeavor. If you wish to study the principles upon

which it is based, read the Compton Commission report; if you want to study the background of the form it took, read the hearings on the Towe bill.

There are only two points of difference which could possibly be construed as major ones insofar as a comparison of my bill and the original Towe bill is concerned:

First, while both anticipate the equivalent of a year's military training through a combination of active and inactive duty training, the Towe bill specifies a 6-month active duty period and H. R. 3558, only 4 months.

Secondly, the Towe bill places control of the money for this program under the civilian commission by implication only; H. R. 3558 specifically names the civilian commission as being the agency to which funds are appropriated for carrying out the program.

The major features of H. R. 3558 are civilian control, integration of the program into normal activities and educational endeavor as much as possible, and effective training for the creation of a large, efficient Reserve force to supplement the Regulars as needed.

The average youngster will embark on this program in his eighteenth year, which, in general, coincides closely with graduation from high school. However, with the parent's consent, it is possible for training to be accomplished during the seventeenth year. Registration, examination, induction, records, and other administrative matters of that nature will be handled through the local selective-service boards. Exemptions or deferments are only allowable in case of extreme hardship, failure to meet military induction standards—though this does not preclude nonmilitary training in the interest of national security being required by the Civilian Commission—availability of training facilities, and previous military service.

The training program aims at the goal of the equivalent of 1 year's active duty through a combination of active- and inactive-duty training. The active-duty or basic-training portion is for the period of 4 months. This period was selected because, first, under an intensified military training program adequate basic training is possible in that period, and, second, the training may be taken during the summer, if desirable, without serious interference with the normal pattern of the youngster's life and education. Consistent with maintaining a balanced military force, each youngster is to be allowed to train in the service of his choice. Immediately upon completion of the 4-month program the trainee must select and enter upon 1 of 10 alternate programs, among which are eight more months of active duty with the training corps, entry into the National Guard or some type of Organized Reserve unit, entry into one of the officer-training programs—including senior ROTC in college—enlistment in the Reserve and entrance into technical or specialist training program in college, or enlistment in the Volunteer Reserve for 6 years as a last alternative, wherein he is subject to 1 month's active-duty training each year. There is afforded in this

plan as much freedom of choice and flexibility as possible so that the youngster may have at least one program available which will fit in with his particular plans for the future. If he does not pursue the alternate program satisfactorily, he is liable for recall by the Civilian Commission for a maximum of 8 months' active-duty training. A system of training credits is provided for so that it is possible for transfers from one alternate program to another to take place without losing credit for the time already served.

The active duty or basic training is conducted in a distinct training corps entitled the National Security Training Corps. While a member of this corps, the trainee operates under a special code of conduct, which is spelled out in the bill, insofar as military law and discipline is concerned. Pay during this period is \$30 a month with additional allowances of \$50 per month for one dependent, \$65 for two or more.

This program is controlled by a National Security Training Commission consisting of five members appointed by the President and approved by the Senate. It is in this connection that I have found an inconsistency in my bill. Apparently, no member of the regular services of the Armed Forces, either active or retired, can serve on the Commission although a military member is mentioned later on in the bill. I am going to change this so that there will be one military member of the Commission. The Commission is appointed for 3 years on a full-time basis. To advise the Commission on moral, religious, recreational, and similar phases of the program, there is provision for a National Security Training Advisory Board of 10 to 25 members which will serve, as necessary, on a part-time basis. The Commission has full control of the program in all its essentials since: (i) It controls the funds by which the program operates and is required to report to Congress semiannually on all such expenditures—sections 343 and 344; (ii) it formulates the program and designates the training agencies to conduct the program—section 324 (a); (iii) it issues the policies, standard, and directives to govern training agencies in the conduct of the program—section 305 (a); and (iv) it ascertains that these policies, standards, and directives are being carried out through a system of civilian inspection—section 305 (b).

The time and rate of the implementation of the program has been left to the President based upon recommendations by the Secretary of Defense and the Commission. It has only been specified that it is the intent of Congress that the implementation of this program shall not interfere with the expansion of the Armed Forces to their authorized strengths. This flexibility has been necessary due to the many factors which cannot be estimated in this particular phase of the program, such as available training facilities, and so forth.

This universal military training program, outlined above, can be pursued irrespective of the operation of a selective service or draft; as a matter of fact,

once in operation, it will simplify greatly their task. The average youngster will complete his basic training; enter one of the alternative programs which will normally be some assignment in the Reserve; and, if the draft takes him before he completes his alternate program, the required active service under the draft will cancel out any further obligations he has under the universal military training program. The principles and operation of the program remain the same regardless of the temper of the times: peace, emergency, draft, or otherwise.

Since 1940 there have been at least 10 universal military training bills of one type and another introduced into the Congress with the attendant hearings and various commission reports. Gentlemen, I believe that all the investigation necessary has been done on this matter and that we have sufficient information to formulate a good, concrete universal military training program. I believe that the Compton Commission Report is one of the finest pieces of work which has been done on the matter; I believe that the Towe bill, with few exceptions, embodied the principles of the Compton Commission Report is a good, workable legislative framework; and I believe that the Russell bill improved on the Towe bill. I do not, then, see the necessity of moving off on another tangent now. I will vote against the Barden substitute and support the committee bill and hope that, as a result of further study, a bill similar to H. R. 3558 will be reported by the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with marked interest to the debate which has taken place for the past week. Many arguments have been put forth on both sides of the aisle in connection with the advisability or inadvisability of including universal military training in the present bill, but I have failed to hear what I believe to be the most vital reason why we should have universal military training, and why we should have it now.

This vital reason to which I refer is that it is only through a system of universal military training that we will ever be able to build up an effective Organized Reserve and National Guard. I happen to be an Army Reserve officer and I have for many years served in the Florida National Guard. I know that there are a number of Members of this body who are also reservists at the present time, or who have in the past been members of the Guard or the Reserves. Any of these gentlemen will tell you that the weakness of any Reserve component program has always been the fact that basically trained enlisted men were not available for enlistment, plus the fact that the turn-over in enlisted men has been so great that it has been impossible to create truly effective units.

Testimony recently given to the House Armed Services Committee indicates that the turn-over in enlisted men in the National Guard runs as high as 30 percent per year. How can you expect to create

an effective military organization with such a large yearly turn-over in personnel?

As General Marshall said:

MILITARY READINESS IMPROVING

We started in June from a state of bankruptcy as to available trained Reserves. Whatever Reserve organizations we had were only 40 or 50 percent of strength, and that strength only partially trained. We had no resources, no established system for the creation of trained manpower.

We know also that the time spent in recruiting consumes a tremendously heavy portion of the time of the men and officers of any unit, and as a result, time that should be spent on the training of the unit as such is not available.

Only under a system of universal military training will there be sufficient men in the National Guard and Organized Reserve units to maintain an effective second line of defense. These trainees will join the Reserve components after completing basic training, and thereafter a progressive mobilization training program can be carried out so as to maintain the unit in a constant state of combat readiness.

Under today's world conditions, where it appears necessary to maintain a high security level, it is vital that we do something to assure that the reserves and the guard become an effective combat force without delay, and it is only through universal military training that this can be accomplished.

Adoption of the substitute will mean a vote for the continuance of an inadequate, undermanned Reserve force not capable of the immediate accomplishment of its assigned mission. Not only is the interest of economy, but to establish an effective second line of defense, I urge the Members of this body to vote against the amendment under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON].

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to place myself on record as favoring universal military training to be put into practice earlier than the committee bill provides. Therefore, I favor the Barden amendment so that the question of universal military training may be considered separately.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday, April 3, I endeavored to advance some thinking in regard to the bill on draft extension and UMT which is now before us. It was not too well received by the Members who were then on the floor of the House and certainly it was not well received by the members of the Committee on Armed Services who were in attendance.

The latter is understandable because I suggested that the subject of universal military training had not been properly or fully considered by the committee of this Congress because no thought at all had been given to the question of what military training was, is, or will be. I suggested that the UMT part of this bill be referred back to the committee for further study.

I still feel that way. In the first place, the present bill as written is merely a capitulation by Congress of its rights and responsibilities as respect universal military training. All we are doing, gentlemen, by this bill is establishing a Commission which will study and propose a UMT program to the Congress. I do not care whether the Congress has to fail to negate the plan in 60 calendar days, or has to affirmatively approve it, or as it now has been amended has to consider it within a specified number of days, the net result is that the Committee on Armed Forces is declining to do its job and is creating a Commission to do it for them. There is a serious constitutional question, aside from the propriety of the action, involved in Congress creating executive commissions to do its legislative work. The constitutional question was raised in the debates on passage of the Reorganization Act of 1949. Expediency disposed of these arguments. We now do not even have the argument of expediency to fall back upon in the present instance. I suggest the danger of this trend. Those who fear a possible dictatorship in this country must realize that this procedure opens the door that much wider. The next push could well be the executive branch writing all legislation referring same to Congress and conducting a strong propaganda campaign and using other pressures on the Congress for its adoption. This would then create a completely subservient Congress. History tells us that the fall of every Republic has come from the attack upon, and the collapse of, the independent legislative branch. It is tragic that the fatal attacks have come from the members of the legislative branch itself. I urge the members of the Armed Services Committee to consider what they are doing in urging the creation of a commission and failing to perform the duty that I, and I presume other Members of the House, thought they had been performing these past 3 months. That duty is no more than to present to this House a complete, well-thought-out manpower training program to meet the emergencies and wars this country might face.

I favor the Barden substitute, and at the same time I urge the Armed Services Committee, for which I have great respect, to immediately go to work and present to this House a real bill that we can consider and vote upon—and with the committee's experience, I believe the committee can do this in 3 months, not 6 months and 45 days.

I want to suggest again some of the basic thinking I believe this Congress must do in approaching a decision on the question of universal military training.

First of all, we must get the glamour of military uniform out of our eyes

and do a job analysis of our Armed Forces. As I stated Tuesday, we have had four basic categories of work activity when this country has been in emergency or war:

First. Those working in defense industry, including farming.

Second. Those working in civil service as employees of the Armed Forces bureaus.

Third. Those working as technicians under military law as part of the Armed Forces.

Fourth. Those engaged in combat work for the Armed Forces.

Now one question is, What group of workers should be in uniform? I suggest that only those in category four need be in uniform. Certainly, there has been no real job analysis made, or attempted, to determine what jobs are benefited by having the performer in uniform.

A corollary to that question is, What physical standards are necessary, based upon a job analysis? Certainly it is stupid to apply combat standards to any but combatants. Solving this problem will go a long way in solving our IV-F problem, which will help our manpower problems.

Another question is, What group of workers need, or are entitled to, veteran benefits? Coupled with this question is, What group needs the incentive of medals, ribbons, and glamour for the performance of their assigned tasks—this is aside from the question of what group is entitled to ribbons, medals, honors, and glamour. I suggest that only those in category four are so entitled. If my thinking is right, or even close to right, we will solve the great problem of administering to our veterans by doing this job analysis.

Another question, and the basic question for Congress to decide, as I argue it, and not some committee appointed by the executive branch of the Government is what organization or organizations should train the workers to fill their jobs in emergency.

Well there seems to be no question about categories one and two. They are traditionally trained by civilian enterprise. However, there is no well-defined line of what jobs are performed under military law and what jobs performed under civilian law. There needs to be, based upon a study of what would be best.

In category 3, and I remind you that approximately 90 percent of those who were in uniform during World War II were in category 3—the noncombatants in uniform—the technicians—who should do their training? I suggest that civilian enterprise is not only best set up to train the personnel, but I even suggest that most of the job performance would be best done under civilian control, rather than military control.

In category 4 are the combatants, and they amount to only 10 percent roughly of our uniformed men, based upon the jobs done in the last war. They should be trained by the military with little or no interference from the civilians.

I might state in regard to this important question, that the present bill be-

fore us, by failing to do, or even consider, a job analysis, is placing not only the 90 percent under the civilian commission, but is also placing the 10-percent combatant group under this civilian commission. The result will be poorer combatant training as well as poorer civilian training.

The congressional committee, and not an executive committee, should further consider the basic question which emerges from these other questions, of whether the assembling of technicians in uniform, if they are to be kept in uniform, should follow the system the Armed Forces want or the system followed in setting up the Seabees.

I quote General Hershey, page 195 of the House hearings, on what the military wants:

I would say that in the Armed Forces and in the Navy, as I have observed them, no matter how much they talk about skill, what they want is a young, smart boy because they can teach him much easier than they can unteach many who come in with a lot of so-called skills but they generally have: (a) a skill which is of doubtful value, unless modified, and (b) a desire to participate only with the skill they have. If there is anything else to be done, they want somebody else to do it. I believe that you just about got to build armies and build navies and build air forces by taking people who have capacity and teaching them what you want them to know, because unfortunately, by and large in our civilian life the type of man we need, and that is the fighter, is only there as an avocation and not as a vocation.

Now, right here, gentlemen, is the philosophy this Congress should resolve and not pass the buck on to an executive commission. Do you agree with General Hershey's statement and philosophy? I personally do not and I am satisfied that any real job analysis of the Armed Forces would knock into a cocked hat this type of thinking. In General Hershey's statement itself, you see the type of deliberate misleading thinking I am talking about. He starts off talking about technical skills and then at the end cinches his argument by talking about fighting or combat skills, on which very few would disagree with him.

In fact, I will state that the main trouble with the Armed Forces in the last war was their failure to do a job analysis of the skills they needed and a concomitant failure to scan the civilian skills existing to put the two together.

The procurement of Seabee personnel in World War II was based upon a philosophy diametrically opposed to that advanced by General Hershey and the Armed Forces. Incidentally, it was put into effect over the great opposition of the Regular Naval Establishment primarily because Secretary Forrestal and Admiral Ben Moreell, a graduate of Washington University Engineering School in St. Louis, not the Academy at Annapolis, had clear eyes.

I believe the success of the Seabees is directly the result of this procurement program. It is a living demonstration of the need for the philosophy I advocate and the elimination of the present philosophy of the armed services and General Hershey.

I want to quote Dr. Karl Compton, who was advancing the argument for the utilization of IV-F's more fully, but in doing so suggests the philosophy I advocate. His statement may be found on page 7 of Calendar No. 116, report of the Committee on Armed Services to accompany S. 1:

Within the group which is not eligible for military service on present standards, there are many who are as well qualified to perform certain essential military duties as are those of higher standards of fitness. * * * The Seabees did a remarkable job but were generally outside the selective service standards. * * * I feel that a decided improvement in manpower utilization is * * * one of the directions in which a major increase in the strength of our Armed Forces might be achieved.

Now, the Seabees were outside the selective service standards not only in a physical way, but also in a procuring way. The Seabees were procured on a basis of matching rates and commissions with technical skills already acquired in civilian endeavors. They were not procured by taking them all in as apprentice seamen and letting the Military Establishment train them. If the military system had been followed, the Seabees would have been members of the naval construction battalions, lost in the shuffle, and not a word on everyone's lips in admiration of the miracles they performed.

My thesis is simple. Congress has a job to do. It is to review the basic system of mobilization in light of our experience. The thinking to date is that of putting new wine into old bottles. If this country is to survive and to remain a republic, and I believe it can with less trouble than might be imagined, we must take off our coats and do some basic work and study. It is our duty and we cannot pass the buck to a civilian commission appointed by the executive branch. I regret to state that, in my opinion, the reason we are not ready today to vote upon a concrete program of peacetime preparation for mobilization or war is because our Armed Services Committee has not done its job. I state again I have confidence in the committee and its chairman. I think we should vote for the Barden bill and refer the matter of peacetime preparation for mobilization or war back to the committee for their prompt consideration and preparation of a bill that will answer the problems that face us which I have tried to suggest in my present remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, in supporting S. 1 as amended by the Committee on Armed Services I am perfectly aware that I am not voting for universal military training. I am merely giving expression to the belief that the enactment of a sound and well conceived program should be given serious consideration by the Congress.

The very concept of universal military training is repugnant to most Americans. It is contrary to national precedent and foreign to our traditions. But we must remember that we are living in unprece-

dented times, and that our minds should be alerted to the needs of the present and to the contingencies of the future insofar as it is possible for us to determine these.

All of us would prefer to demobilize our Armed Forces, destroy our weapons of war and the arsenals which produce them and through the power of moral persuasion point out the road to peace. But, Mr. Chairman, we realize that such an approach would be suicidal at this time, for so long as the rulers in the Kremlin retain their almost pathological zeal for world domination or until they have become convinced that the free nations of the world possess power superior to that of Russia and her satellites, we will be confronted with momentous questions. Even if the Korean War should end tomorrow, could we ignore the fact that the most powerful revolutionary force in history poses a constant threat to our security as a Nation?

If we are going to be realistic I think we must recognize that the present emergency is not likely to be of short duration. It is almost certain to be with us for years, and only pure folly will persuade us to meet this challenge on a day-to-day basis. We must have a consistent, long-range program which will not be abandoned until it is certain that the danger no longer exists.

Universal military training might well be an essential of such a program. It would constitute one of the best possible means of averting major war because nothing is more discouraging to a potential aggressor than large reserves of manpower and equipment in the hands of his contemplated victim.

So, in a very real sense, UMT represents a strategy for peace, but we should never labor under the illusion that armed force represents the ultimate solution to international problems. At best this can serve only as a necessary deterrent to war while we seek ways and means to ameliorate the basic causes of such disasters.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, never have we in the Congress faced a decision with more soul searching.

As a former member of the United States Naval Reserve, as a former school teacher who recognizes full well the impact on our youth of the present program, I have tried to face each of the problems presented today with one thought uppermost: What is best for my country?

I have dedicated myself to—

First. Strengthening the United States militarily, morally, and spiritually.

Second. Mobilizing all of the resources of this Nation to meet fully and swiftly the requirements of the emergency and to see to it that this burden falls as equitably as can be upon all our people.

Third. Opposing any secret commitments to any other nation. The recent exchanges between Washington and Tokyo and between the Foreign Office in London and our State Department indicate the new importance of my attitude.

If this national emergency is to continue for a long time—and the present indications are that it is—we must decide on a sound system of universal military training under civilian control.

I believe we must have a better utilization of existing manpower priorities if we are to provide effective help in solving our problems. The American people very properly are demanding that the Pentagon itself set a proper example in this respect.

We must develop immediately a much fairer system for our National Guard and Reserve units.

I personally consider the draft bill and the universal military training program as part and parcel of the same problem. Each must be considered in the light of the other. Unless we provide for a proper system of universal military training now, we shall be forced to keep a large standing army of draftees and Reservists in active duty status for a long time.

All of us must ask ourselves this question: "Shall I stand up and dedicate my thinking, my action, and my prayers to the protection of my country?"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized.

(Mr. GROSS, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. STEFAN, and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. O'HARA.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, now we come to that time in the debate where there is that hush before the solemn hour when we as Members of Congress have to make our decision of most grave importance.

I realize that many of my distinguished friends are finding themselves in trouble because they fear that if they vote for the Barden substitute that will be a vote in opposition to universal military training. Personally, I cannot see their reasoning as to the UMT issue. We do not deal with the question of something that is important for the needs of the armed services or to the winning of the Korean War or something that is at all important in the matter of a reserve pool, but we are being asked to vote to direct that somebody appoint a commission to come back and make a report to the Armed Services Committee, and then the Armed Services Committee is supposed to do something that they could do at this very minute, if they wanted to—a perfectly ridiculous procedure by legislative act.

If we were going to vote on the question of the draft, I do not think there would be a half a dozen votes against it, but I am going to vote for the Barden bill upon the theory that I refuse to commit myself to some unknown principle, upon some unknown program about which I know nothing, and which may commit me to being for a permanent peacetime draft.

When the hearings were begun in this body and the other body there was a perfect uproar about the terrible shortage of manpower that was necessary for the armed services; that we would have

to take the 18-year-olds, that we needed those 18-year-olds to fill up the gap.

I call your attention to the front page of the Washington Star of last evening, to an Associated Press report which says, "The draft boards are told to delay calls for May, to delay all calls for May, until further orders come from General Hershey."

Now, just what sort of a state of confusion are we in? Are we being given untrue facts as to the manpower condition so that we do not know what is the situation? Are we being kidded about the condition of our manpower pool, or are our armed services completely unable to take care of these youngsters who are being drafted to such an extent that they cannot equip and train them now? What is going on? I would assume that the members of the Armed Services Committee would know the answer, and I yield to them if they can explain why this announcement of the suspension of the draft call by General Hershey, if they know. There being no reply, I assume that they do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am in accord with the gentleman's views and will also vote for the Barden bill.

Mr. O'HARA. I have said all that I wanted to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes; I have waited a long time for the gentleman to get around to answering.

Mr. BROOKS. What is the question?

Mr. O'HARA. I asked if any member of the Armed Services Committee knew why the suspension of the draft call for May had been issued?

Mr. BROOKS. I heard the gentleman's question, but I just wanted to be sure that I understood it. I can say this, that draft calls prior to that had been sufficient, now they are catching up. They had delinquency trouble and they want to catch up and do things in an orderly manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I propose to support the Barden amendment, not because I am opposed to universal military training but because I am opposed to the abdication of its policy-making authority by this Congress. I have not heard one iota of evidence during this entire debate which would support any belief that the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives is unqualified and incompetent to write the details of this plan.

If the House Committee on Armed Services needs more staff to develop this plan in detail and present it here for enactment as a policy-making function of this body they should have the additional assistance they need. That is the way this law should be passed. We should not delegate to a presidentially appointed board or commission the right

to draft our laws. On that basis and on that basis only I am voting for the Barden amendment.

Even aside from its constitutional responsibility, the Armed Services Committee is the peculiarly appropriate agency to draft military manpower legislation. Manpower is only one phase of our peacetime national defense and should be considered in its proper perspective, and in its proper relationship to other aspects of our national defense system. The National Security Training Commission will necessarily be confined to a consideration of manpower and would have no jurisdiction over related components of the defense machine.

We frequently fall into the error of speaking as if numbers of soldiers determined the strength of our defense. Our defense also rests upon our possession of strategic materials, the efficiency and vitality of our national production plant, our control of strategic overseas bases, the accuracy and extent of our intelligence, the comparative quality of our research and development in weapons and techniques, the efficiency of military logistics and supply, the smoothness and effectiveness of our industrial mobilization controls, and the fundamental health of our free economy to wage all-out war.

I wish to call to the attention of the Committee the Fifth Annual Report of the Senate War Investigating Committee filed with the United States Senate September 3, 1946—Report No. 110, part 7, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session.

This unanimous report sought to summarize briefly some of the principles of a sound national defense which emerged from 5½ years investigation of the national defense program by the members and staff of the Truman-Mead committee.

There is time here to quote only a very few of the committee's conclusions and a few passages from its comments relating to military manpower. However, even these brief excerpts should be convincing that the character and extent of our military manpower and the character of its training are an integral part of our entire defense effort:

1. Our national defense today requires a highly trained armed force, equipped with the most modern weapons, and capable of rapid expansion in time of emergency. At the beginning of World War II this Nation had no such force. It cannot be assumed that a numerically superior armed force is in itself an adequate defense. The quality rather than the quantity of our Army and Navy will be the best guaranty for an adequate defense.

2. Since service in the Armed Forces during peacetime should be such as to attract able, intelligent men, an intensive study of personnel matters in the Army and Navy should be made for the purpose of setting up a promotion system which will insure that the best qualified men, regardless of age or seniority in service, will obtain the most responsible positions (p. 1).

7. The United States is abandoning overseas bases acquired during the war at great cost in lives and dollars. Many of these bases are commercially useful during peacetime, and would have strategic military importance in another emergency. The War,

Navy, and State Departments should have had plans, before the end of the war, to utilize those overseas bases necessary to our national defense, and they should have used the full weight of our bargaining power in executing these plans. The appropriate Government agencies must now work out and set into operation a feasible program for the acquisition or use of strategic overseas bases.

8. Under present world conditions the national defense will suffer unless the United States has a more efficient intelligence agency, in both military and nonmilitary fields, than we had before World War II. Knowledge of international economic, political, and social conditions is necessary if sound diplomatic decisions are to be made. Furthermore, data obtained by an intelligence service can assist in determining the size and character of the Armed Force to be maintained for the defense of our Nation. The establishment of a superior intelligence organization is good economy (p. 2).

9. More businesslike administrative methods in the Armed Forces during the emergency would have brought the war to a victorious conclusion at an earlier date, with less cost in life, dollars, and natural resources. Whenever practical, war should not be waged by decisions in disregard of sound business principles. The Armed Forces should bend all efforts toward improving administrative procedures and eliminating weaknesses in procurement and supply (p. 3).

We did not enter either World War I or World War II with an Army and a Navy equipped and trained to fight a major war. Primarily, we were able to fight and win both wars because of our industrial supremacy, our huge reservoir of certain important raw materials and the energy, ingenuity, and valor of our people. In an amazingly short period of time, we proved our ability to forge swords out of plowshares and to use them effectively against the enemy (p. 3).

It must not, however, be assumed that a numerically superior military and naval force is of itself an adequate defense. In the future we must maintain an adequate Army and Navy. History has indicated over and over again that a large and supposedly excellent Army and Navy may be useless props to rely upon for national defense. At the beginning of World War II France and Russia were thought to have the largest armies and the United States and Great Britain the largest navies in existence, but the combined total of this military array did not prevent aggressor nations from attacking them. Without our industrial supremacy those forces might not have prevented our utter defeat.

An adequate national defense today requires much more than merely an army and a navy. It requires the best army and the best navy, and it requires a national economy which can swiftly and smoothly be converted to a machine of defense superior to that of any probable combination of enemies.

The pitfall to be avoided is a military and naval force in being which gives the appearance of an adequate protective force, but which through obsolescence and backwardness is unable to cope with a more modern and more effective—although a smaller and less spectacular—opposing force (p. 4).

In 1933 the Germany Army was composed of only 1,100,000 officers and men. In that same year, the French Army had 6,952,000 men. The sudden and comparatively easy defeat of France by the German Army in 1940 proved that size of a nation's army and even military expenditures, in which France led in the period between the two wars, do not guarantee adequate protection. The defeat of France in 1940 established that modern

equipment and modern techniques were far more important than mere size (p. 5).

In this machine age of rapid transportation and more and more destructive weapons, great numbers of men in an army are, by themselves, of very little significance. Failure to realize this may induce a false sense of security, such as the French had prior to this war.

The committee expresses no opinion as to the optimum size of our armed forces, but the committee emphasizes that quality is much more important than quantity. A good little army is worth more than a poor large army. Whatever size we agree on will be valuable only if we maintain quality, both in equipment and in men. And it will always be better to sacrifice numbers for quality (p. 5).

Service in the Armed Forces during peacetime should be such as to attract the best and ablest of our young men, and having attracted them, we should be sure that we are exploiting to the fullest their talents.

With a high-grade leadership in the Armed Forces, many of the other problems of national defense can be more easily solved. Without a high caliber personnel, the best possible plans will mean little (p. 26).

The Armed Services Committee, and the House of Representatives, viewing military manpower legislation as an integral part of our entire national defense policy is in a better position to write a universal military training plan or bill than any board the President can appoint, even if every one of the five members turns out to be a genius.

I, for one, am unwilling to admit that the Congress has become incapable of writing the laws of this country. I am forced to the conclusion that the committee bill, even in its more palatable form, constitutes an admission of legislative incompetence and a repudiation of our solemn constitutional obligation to execute the legislative power of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized.

(Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to yield to Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts the time allotted to him.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the whole country has been deeply shocked, wrought up, and is deeply unhappy by the removal of General MacArthur. They are very angry. There was no question of incompetency. Gen. Douglas MacArthur is a superb fighting general, an able and skillful administrator, and he is adored by the Japanese for his assistance in rehabilitation. Japan was safe with General MacArthur; everybody felt that the Pacific was safe with General MacArthur. They knew that General MacArthur was the last bulwark against communism. Now they wonder what will happen. His sacrifice, this horrible thing, must not have been in vain. We need to be strong now in a military way much more than we did when General MacArthur was in command there in the Pacific. Weakness would be disastrous for us, disastrous for every country in the world. General MacArthur would want our military defense strong.

I am voting against the Barden amendment. I feel that we need universal military training now. The Legion

has wanted universal military training ever since its beginning. The co-called Vinson committee bill is better than anything that has been suggested thus far.

I have always voted for national defense and have never regretted it. I remember voting—and it passed by one vote—the continuation of selective service; then came the attack on Pearl Harbor. What would have happened had our forces been dissipated and we not had an army? I remember the fortification vote of Guam. I remember a Congressman whose son was killed on Guam who voted against its fortification. It might not have made a great deal of difference, but I know that it haunted him all his life. I voted for the fortification for Guam. I believed Japan only respected and feared strength.

I voted for the 70-group Air Force, and the naval airplane carriers. The removal of Admiral Denfeld for saying what was necessary for naval strength was not in vain. It resulted in a stronger Navy. The sacrifice of General MacArthur must not be made in vain.

Mr. Chairman, we hear a great deal about women not wanting UMT, not wanting a very strong national defense, not wanting their men to be soldiers. Do you suppose there is a mother or father today who would not want his son to have basic training before going to war? Do you suppose there is a wounded boy today in any hospital who does not beg to have the boys given basic military training before going to the front? UMT would assure this. The Daughters of the American Revolution have endorsed UMT. Mrs. Becker of New Jersey is the chairman of the women's national defense group. The following is the list of some 34 women's patriotic organizations participating in the twenty-fifth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense in Washington in January of 1951, who endorsed UMT. These women's patriotic groups represent 1,000,000 women:

Mrs. Walter H. Boyd, national president, American Gold Star Mothers, Inc., 1255 East Second Street, Long Beach, Calif.

Mrs. David Brughelli, national president, American Gold Star Sisters, Inc., 2046 Greenwich Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Mrs. Willis C. Reed, national president, American Legion Auxiliary, 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis 7, Ind.

Mrs. Paul Charles Wright, national president, American War Dads Auxiliary, 513 Railway Exchange Building, Kansas City 6, Mo.

Mrs. Gertrude Warner, national president, American War Mothers, 306 North Washington Avenue, Scranton, Pa.

Mrs. Thomas William Smith, national president, American Women's Legion of World Wars, the Embassy, Apartment 301, Sixteenth and Howard Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Hazel Rue Scott, national president, Blue Star Mothers of America, 111 Cherokee Trail, Willoughby, Ohio.

Mrs. Dolly LeBlanc, national president, Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, Ladies Auxiliary, 70 Lenox Road, Brooklyn 26, N. Y.

Miss Frances Eddy Curtis, national president, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, 350 Monterey Avenue, Detroit 3, Mich.

Mrs. Claude W. Dudley, national president, Daughters of the United States Army, 111 Highland Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.

Mrs. Beatrice Parmeter, national president, Ladies Auxilliary to the Military Order of the Purple Heart, 4500 Harvey Way, Long Beach, Calif.

Mrs. George A. Ilg, national president, Ladies Auxilliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 406 West Thirty-fourth Street, Kansas City, Mo.

Mrs. Bessie Hart, national president, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, 527 North Noble Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

Mrs. Bessie Mittlesteadt, national president, Marine Corps League Auxilliary, 257 Division Street, North Towanda, N. Y.

Mrs. Evelyn McCaslin, national president, National Amvets Auxilliary, 2475 Parkview Drive, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio.

Mrs. Lillian E. Bauman, national president, National Auxilliary, United Spanish War Veterans, 40 G Street NE, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Minna D. Levine, national president, National Ladies Auxilliary, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, 1776 Broadway, New York 19, N. Y.

Mrs. William B. Shelton, national president, National Society for Constitutional Security, 450 Washington Avenue, Brooklyn 5, N. Y.

Mrs. Marion U. Mansur, national president, National Society, Daughters of the Revolution, 32 Spruce Street, Malden 8, Mass.

Mrs. Franke Wolfe, president general, National Society, Daughters of the Union, 1861-65, Inc., The Lindens, 187 South Babylon Turnpike, Merrick, N. Y.

Miss Julia C. Fish, president general, National Society of New England Women, 13710 Shaker Boulevard, apartment 700, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mrs. Ida Suber, national president, National Society, Service Star Legion, Inc., 409 Bell Avenue, New Castle, Pa.

Mrs. Eula M. Nelson, national president, National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxilliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, 848 South Spring Street, Springfield, Ill.

Mrs. Mae E. Shuttlesworth, national commander, National Yeoman F, 658 East Fifty-seventh Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mrs. Jeannette Miller, national commander, Navy Club, U. S. A. Auxilliary, 1609 Central Tower, Youngstown, Ohio.

Mrs. Eleanor I. Coner, national president, Navy Mothers Club of America, West Lake Road, Honeoye, N. Y.

Mrs. Edwin DeWitt Coddington, president, New York City Colony, National Society of New England Women, 321 Kenmore Road, Douglas Manor, Long Island, N. Y.

Mrs. Julian C. Smith, national president, Society of the Sponsors of the United States Navy, 5 Edgewood Terrace, Belle Haven, Alexandria, Va.

Mrs. Jassamine Doran, national commander, United States Army Mothers, State Fairgrounds, Lincoln, Nebr.

Mrs. John J. Doyle, national president, Women of the Army and Navy Legion Valor of the U. S. A., 13 Evelyn Avenue, Malden, Mass.

Mrs. Harrison Smith, chairman, Women's National Defense Committee of Philadelphia, 803 Weightman Building, 1524 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. Albert Reinke, national president, Gold Star Wives of America, Inc., room 1436-37 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. Augustus Dunaway, Reserve Officers Association Ladies Clubs of the United States, 5348 Broadway Terrace, Oakland, Calif.

Mrs. Evangeline M. Trenchard, national president, the National Gold Star Mothers, Inc., 664 Harrison Avenue, Ardsley, Pa.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, although the demands of necessity have eliminated an immediate program for universal military training from the pending manpower bill, there is still an opportunity remaining for UMT.

A vote for the pending Barden substitute will be a vote against UMT. A vote against the substitute is a vote toward the establishment of a regular system of universal military training.

UMT is the one hope for establishing a permanent system to preserve the strength of the United States without resorting to a permanent draft. With a large backlog of trained reserves, we can keep the strength necessary to resist communism all down the line.

America cannot long continue to move from crisis to crisis, from war scare to war scare.

The grave weaknesses in our foreign policy following World War II were largely the result of our depleted military resources. We followed the usual mistake of reducing ourselves to military impotence, and today we are paying the price.

UMT offers the one hope of avoiding this mistake in the future. We should vote today for American security.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time may be given to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this very important issue and vital legislation has been carried on on a very high plane. The pros and cons of almost all points of interest have been thoroughly discussed and debated. The able and distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and the members of the committee have made a most thorough, lucid, and impressive exposition of the measure before us. These gentlemen, the chairman and the members of the committee, have carried the burden of debate on the issue and certainly it could not be in better hands.

It shall not be my purpose, therefore, Mr. Chairman, to take the time of the committee to discuss in any detail the measure before us or to delay the vote on this bill.

I do, however, wish to be heard briefly to make a few observations. For certainly this is a most historic occasion—and this is a most historic debate.

The issue establishing universal military training has been long with us.

Universal military training was first proposed and advocated by Gen. George Washington during the early days of our Nation's infancy. It has long been advanced in many quarters and much discussed. Such a proposal has been the subject of study and consideration outside this Chamber—but this is the first time that such proposal has ever reached the floor of the House of Representatives for formal debate.

This is why I feel that this is a most historic occasion. This is an occasion when I feel every Member has an obligation to make known his views and opinions on this important legislation.

As the measure now stands, I shall support it—the committee bill, not the adulterated substitute. We, in our search for peace, have so far not achieved the success for which we work and pray. As a nation, we must remain constantly vigilant and watchful and militarily strong and prepared. I regret that this bill is necessary—but, in all honesty, it must be said that the approval of this measure is one of the most pressing and urgent issues before us today in our history.

Two World Wars have been thrust upon us because we were militarily weak. Danger of another hovers near or recedes in direct proportion to our gaining strength.

It is because of the truth of this fact that some form—some proper form—of universal military training fits into today's picture and is of such vital importance.

Almost everyone agrees, Mr. Chairman, that the present grave international situation may continue for an indefinite period. To meet the immediate challenge of this unrest and for our Nation's future security, legislation of the nature here proposed seems essential and necessary, and we must face up to the test and challenge of the hour pressed upon us. I shall vote for this measure and I want the people of my State and district to know why I shall vote for this legislation at this time.

My reasons, stated simply, are these:

First of all, this measure would guarantee to our Nation a steady flow of reserves into the Armed Forces—reserves that have been trained and would be ready to serve efficiently in time of emergency. Certainly the Members of this body do not need a further expression of the reasons why our country must be provided with such Reserve forces. Information made available to us discloses this fact and the daily papers tell us these reasons in very bold and black type.

Second, this measure would permit a reduction in the total strength of our military components and thus permit the return to their homes, their families and their businesses of many men with dependents and overage who have been called to duty. It is only by assuring a steady flow of trained and equipped reserves, that it will ever be possible to effect an over-all reduction in the numbers of our military manpower, and I, for one, would like to see our military re-

quirements met with the most efficient use of both manpower and funds.

It should be pointed out, also, that by providing a system of adequately trained military men, we can protect our Nation against the tremendously expensive and wasteful system of sudden expansion to meet emergency situations, followed by equally wasteful demobilization after the crisis has temporarily passed. We cannot indulge in the luxury of meeting each new emergency with emergency measures. We should take action to solve these problems and provide for some stability of purpose.

Third, the measure as written by the distinguished committee provides for civilian control and supervision of the UMT provisions of this Act. I believe that no portion will be more generally approved than this provision to keep the initial training program of our young reserves in civilian hands. The measure further provides for a very close supervision of the training program by the Congress—another meritorious feature—when such may be enacted.

As I have said, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the debate on this issue is in the very best of hands. I did, however, want to present these few points and to make my position clear, so that there be no misunderstanding of how I stand and how I shall vote. The vote which we shall cast may well be one of the most important cast in the history of the Congress. Action which we take here today may well be the greatest contribution which our Nation can make toward achieving and maintaining a lasting peace.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me be given the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the committee will vote down the Barden amendment and let us proceed in an orderly fashion to pass upon the committee bill which was reported after more than 60 days of hearings. We have continually gone up in time of an emergency with our Armed Forces and have immediately gone down when the danger has passed.

It is essential that we have the UMT program set up, a plan submitted and adopted, so that when the time comes that men are no longer necessary for service we will have a place for them to be trained. Presumably when that time comes under present plans we will have 3,500,000 men with the system of UMT established. Those men would continue on duty, and when their tours had ended, then your active force would go down. You will have time to get your first men out of UMT into your Reserve, and your Reserves would go up.

It is essential that we have the plan so worked out and in readiness to start when we quit drafting for service so that those 3,500,000 or whatever it may be, on a level plane, will go down gradually

as the 24- or 26-month period of service is terminated for the individuals. It would give us time to turn at least one or maybe two of the increments out of the UMT program. With your Reserves going up, we are in position to protect the country, and in that manner we will not face the point where there will be a hiatus in the program, where we will have to maintain men on active duty at full pay and have all of the 3,500,000 or whatever we have in the service.

When the time comes that we no longer draft them we will be able to put them in the Reserves on a permanent basis. It is highly important at this time that we see to it that both phases of the program are passed, that we continue the Draft Act as it is at present in order to take care of the present existing emergency, and that we be well prepared ready with the machinery, a plan approved, so that we can convert immediately from a large active-duty force to the orderly organization and build up of a Reserve.

I know that many say here "I am going to vote for the Barden bill, but." There is no "but" about it. Throughout this debate there has been an attempt on the part of many—I felt it from the time we started—of saying "I am neither for or against UMT, but this time I am going to vote in a certain way because of certain objections." There have been as many objections as there are provisions in the bill. This idea of "I am going to vote for the Barden bill, but I am for UMT" is past. You are up against it now. It is a question of whether you are going to adopt the Barden bill and throw out the provisions of the House committee's bill without ever coming to a vote on it, or whether you are going to face the issue squarely.

I sincerely trust that the Barden amendment in the nature of a substitute will be defeated and that we will proceed to the orderly consideration of amendments and vote on the committee bill as reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against the Barden amendment because I am for universal military training. It has been interesting to me to hear Members justify their votes on this bill and say that they do not believe that a vote against the Barden amendment indicates that they oppose universal military training. I think it is significant that all of those who are opposed to universal military training are supporting the Barden amendment. I am for universal military training because I believe that in voting for that I am reflecting the views of the great majority of the people of my district.

More than 2 years ago I sent out a questionnaire asking for the views of my constituents on this question. Out of more than 11,000 questions sent out more than 68 percent expressed themselves as being in favor of universal military training. The reason they are for universal military training is because

they are for a preparedness program. Those people at that time voted more than 92 percent for a continuation of a strong preparedness program in this country. I do not think that the committee bill goes far enough, but at least it makes a start and will give us a start on universal military training which this country needs so bad.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, many subjects have been discussed in the course of the debate on this bill, but there is one subject to which the supporters of UMT have failed to address themselves: that is, their major premise that such a program will provide a reservoir of trained men; that it will provide an adequate Reserve; that it will prevent the sending of untrained men into combat. I think that the gentlemen, instead of assuming this fundamental proposition, should have undertaken to prove it. I say that UMT will accomplish no such magic.

There are, in the armed services, many hundreds, if not thousands, of classifications of specialized jobs. Any man, to be qualified for any of these specialized jobs, must, in addition to receiving the usual basic military training, receive specialized training. This additional training requires anything from a matter of months to a matter of years. By the very fact of the multiplicity of these specialized jobs it would be impracticable to attempt to train men in all of these various skills in any mass military-training program. However, even were this not so, the very shortness of the proposed training period would make it impossible to adequately train men in any but a very few of these specialties.

Since the present bill does not set up any program, or give any indication of what form such a program might take, we must, for lack of anything more specific, assume that it will take a form similar to some of the programs which have previously been proposed. All of these proposals have been designed to train just one type of military men—infantrymen. Now it happens that combat infantrymen constitute at most only about 10 percent of the men in the Army ground forces. The Army, in turn, at most, has only half of all the men in uniform. Hence, at best, the UMT might train, to some degree, about 5 percent of the men who go through the program in the skills which they will need if they are some day called to the colors to defend their country. To put it another way, UMT, instead of providing us with a pool of trained men, would provide us with a pool of men, 1 out of 20 of whom would be trained—to some extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

(Mr. NICHOLSON asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. BROWN of Ohio.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the Barden substitute to the Vinson bill for the reason that I feel very strongly that UMT legislation has

no part or place in any measure to extend the Selective Service Act.

I would also like to say to the Members of the House that the real reason why we have such a weak provision in the pending bill on UMT is simply because the committee, or the leadership of the Committee on Armed Services, came to the rather reluctant conclusion the House would not approve its original bill carrying provisions for an out and out UMT program to be established some time in the future as the administration might see fit. So they decided to bring in amendments to the original committee bill to make the measure more palatable and easier to swallow. Remember, however, that even the provision now contained in the committee bill is not the one you will actually be voting on. Instead, you will actually be voting on some unknown UMT provision as it comes back from conference. Whether you believe in UMT or are opposed to it, UMT should not be enacted into law as a part of the extension of the draft. Instead, it should stand on its own feet and be voted on in the American way. I do not trust, and I am saying this advisedly, those who will appoint the commission which will establish some sort of a UMT training program to become effective if this bill is approved. UMT cannot be put into effect now. It can only begin some time in the future long after those individuals who would name the commission have been driven out of office by the wrath of the American people. One of the questions we must decide here is whether we shall grant them these powers. I think I know, at least I have a strong opinion, as to the kind of people who will be named to serve on this commission to draw up the UMT program, if it is authorized. If we are to have UMT I want the plan for it to be drawn up by people in whom I have faith and confidence as good, honest-to-God Americans.

It is time we stop standing here in the well of the House criticizing many of the actions of those now in the control of our Government one day and then the next be turning around and casting our votes in favor of delegating the powers of this Congress, and of future Congresses to these very same officials and to those they may name to represent them.

We appreciate the need for extending the draft for as long as we are at war—but we are opposed to the using of the present national emergency as an excuse for fastening on America a permanent conscription and UMT program. Let UMT be considered on its own merits as a separate legislative action.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the section of this bill with regard to universal military training, it provides that the President will appoint a commission of his own choice subject to approval of the majority of

the Senate, that will submit a proposal for a universal military training program.

The proposed program is to be submitted within 6 months. It will be submitted direct to the House Committee on Armed Services, exactly the same committee that has charge of this legislation. The House committee will be required under this bill to either approve or reject the proposal within 45 days. If approved, the proposal, in the form of a bill, will come direct to Congress for consideration. Then, if enacted into law, the same commission that prepared the legislation, will administer the act.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the commission will write the bill and administer the act, if approved. This is subject only to amendments that may be approved by the House. If I am incorrect in this general statement, I would like to be so advised.

It seems to me you are going far afield when you authorize and direct a commission appointed by the Executive to prepare and submit legislation which directs that the same commission who writes the bill shall administer it. At least, it is a departure from the ordinary manner of handling legislation in Congress.

If a plan or proposal for universal military training is to be submitted 6 months from now, as you propose under this bill, why not let the Committee on Armed Services, who represents the Congress and the people, study the problem and hold hearings on it. What valid reason is there for delegating this important authority and responsibility to a group of people outside of Congress and appointed by the President. Let the Armed Services Committee study the legislation and hold hearings on it. Then let the great Armed Services Committee bring its bill to the House with its recommendations. If the House, by its vote, decides the legislation should be administered by a Commission, good and well, but, in substance, here you let the same Commission write the bill. Again, I say the Armed Services Committee should assume its responsibility of holding hearings and writing the proposed legislation, as is done with all other legislation. I remind you again, the Commission that will submit the proposed measure is appointed, not by the Congress or a committee of Congress, but by the President. Then you go so far as to limit your own committee to 45 days during which to consider the proposal of the committee. Six months for the Presidential Commission to study the problem and then 45 days for your committee during which to take action.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the Barden amendment because I am opposed to universal military training at this time. Legislation providing for an extension of the draft is sufficient at this time.

I am especially against that provision of the Vinson bill that sets up a commission with power to bring in a report which the Committee on Armed Services

will be required to consider and which when the committee does consider will be given a privileged status so that it can be brought up for consideration in the House. This is contrary to the regular procedure.

If the Vinson bill is passed and a commission is set up, this commission will take the place of Congress for what the commission recommends will have to be considered by the Committee on Armed Services of the House. I know that Mr. VINSON claims that the committee will have the power to reject the recommendation of the commission but I also know that when this commission's report and recommendations come in, they will come in with the implied understanding that they have the approval of the President for the commission will have been appointed by the President. I also know that Chairman VINSON then with his usual zeal will argue that the work of this commission has the approval of the military authorities and that the Members of Congress should give consideration to the wishes of the President and the military. In other words, the reason for setting up this commission plan is that Mr. VINSON appreciated that he could not pass his original bill which provided for straight-out universal military training but that he could bring about universal military training by the setting up of this commission and then putting the burden on the Congress to reject the commission's report and if the Congress did not reject the commission's report, it would in due course become law.

From this you can see that if this commission is appointed and if it functions as Mr. VINSON would like for it to function, the recommendations of the commission would become law unless Congress expressly rejected it. In other words, if this Vinson bill is passed the action of the commission appointed under the Vinson bill may, if not rejected, become the law of the land.

Mr. Chairman, this is a complete abdication by the Congress of the rights and duties imposed upon it by the Constitution. This abdication will be in favor of a commission of five men appointed by the President and not elected by the people.

Mr. Chairman, the Barden amendment will provide for a draft law and will not provide for universal military training, and will not in any way call for the surrender by Congress of any of its constitutional powers or duties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, this is the critical vote. This vote is the one that is going to decide whether or not you will have universal military training. If the Barden amendment carries, certainly it is the purpose of the author of it to dispense with the universal military training provisions of the bill, so this vote is critical.

I am supporting the original committee bill because I believe in defense through strength. We cannot fool ourselves and we cannot fool the American

people. If we do not have national defense, we do not have national security, that is all there is to it.

I have seen two World Wars come on us when we did not have an adequate national defense, and I saw those wars engulf us. I believe that if we had had universal military training we would not be over in Korea today, fighting an ugly struggle over there and sometimes having to apologize for it.

I am supporting this bill because it also gives us a strong Reserve program and an orderly, well-balanced Reserve program. I think this is the way to do it. I do not apologize to anyone for coming into the House of Representatives on behalf of national defense. I do not think any of us ought to apologize for bringing universal military training in with another bill, or in a separate bill, or any way it does come in. When we are here to protect the American people and give them the security to which they are entitled, I do not think we ought to worry about how the measure comes to the Congress or what procedure is used. So I am supporting the original committee bill and hope it carries by an overwhelming vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, if I were opposed to a system of universal military training I would of course vote for the pending Barden substitute. However, in view of the fact that I favor a form of universal military training and I believe the vast majority of American people want it and are entitled to it, I am going to vote against the Barden amendment.

It has been said here that the people do not want this training program. And it has been said it would be bad because it would give the military control over the minds of young men and pave the way for a military dictatorship in this country.

I deny, Mr. Chairman, that the vast majority of the American people do not want universal military training. I think the majority would like for conditions to be such that we could forget about military matters entirely. I think that the vast majority are sick and tired of war. But I am equally convinced that the overwhelming majority of the American people are realistic and recognize the grave danger that confronts the free world today. They have not forgotten that we were favored by fate on two occasions and were, by the grace of God, permitted some 2 years during which to get prepared for the showdown. And those same people are realistic enough to know that fate will not be so kind to us the next time. Yes; the American people are danger-conscious and they are preparedness-conscious. They expect this Congress to rise to the occasion and do something about our security whenever the occasion arises.

Do the American people want UMT? While the Gallup poll is by no means conclusive as a barometer of public opinion, it is recognized, I think, as a good indicator of trends and indeed its findings are often amazingly accurate.

XCVII—239

For 8 years now Dr. Gallup has been sounding the American people out on this subject of universal military training, and on eight occasions has taken a test. It is significant that on every one of those occasions the result showed the sentiment to be more than 2 to 1 in favor of such a program.

Opponents of UMT have said that such a thing would breed a military nation and lay the ground work for a military dictatorship. But there is no basis for such contention. This program contemplates a training period of 6 months. It may be integrated with school work. It will be under the direction of a civilian—not a military—board. And it will be under the constant scrutiny of Congress. We are here simply committing ourselves to a blueprint for a program to be advanced at a later date when conditions will permit a training program to be put into effect following the use of the draft. It cannot be put into effect until then, and that may be 1 or 2 or 3 years from now.

Mr. Chairman, let us remember that there are many millions of veterans of the last two wars—indeed some thirteen or fourteen million from the last war alone. Did their military training for periods far exceeding 6 months leave them potential pawns in the hands of a military dictatorship? Of course not. There are many distinguished Members of this House who served for several years and who have brilliant military records. Have you seen any evidence of their inclination to become victims of a Pentagon-directed military control as a result? Of course not.

Universal military training is a vital part of our preparedness program. It is designed to create a reservoir of reservists from which men can be called to meet any emergency that may arise. Any time it is no longer needed it can be discontinued. It will save the American taxpayers a lot of money because, as has been pointed out, it will obviate the need for a huge standing Army if the world situation does not become more serious. UMT will provide a citizens' army and it will put fear in the hearts of the Kremlin whose war makers recognize only force and power in their dealings with the world.

It may be that through this preparedness program, firmly and resolutely carried out, the hand of the would-be enemy will be stayed. You do not see people going around socking Jack Dempsey or Joe Louis on the jaw. The Kremlin respects power and force. And a reservoir of trained reservists, who can be mobilized on short notice, constitute just that.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against the Barden substitute and for this bill. I firmly believe that at this moment it provides the best possible assurance for our survival and the best insurance for peace on this earth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I stated at the beginning of this debate that the

Nation was at the crossroads. We will reach a decision shortly as to whether or not we will continue to force on this country the maintenance of a large standing army for an indefinite period of time or whether we can reduce that large standing army by establishing a program which will create a Reserve force to take the place of a large standing army. I certainly hope, in the interest of security and in the interest of economy, that it will be possible to create a Reserve and dispense with a large standing army which will be necessary for the country to maintain if the Barden amendment is agreed to. A vote for the Barden amendment means that this Nation will have to have a large standing army for an indefinite period of time. A vote against the Barden amendment means that we will have an opportunity to build up a Reserve and reduce the size of the standing army.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, in a few minutes we are going to vote on the substitute amendment which I have offered, and the bill as it was changed and brought in by the Committee on Armed Services and then of course changed greatly since it reached the floor. I say to you in all sincerity it has not been pleasant for me to carry on this fight. I am not a trouble maker in this House who goes around looking for an opportunity to pick on legislation or on some committee's legislation. But after I read the original bill which the Committee on Armed Services was considering, I had such a profound conviction that it was bad for my people, bad on our schools, colleges, and the American way of life, that I could not withstand the pressure. That original bill was changed and the next bill they approved was brought in and it was much better but I did not think good enough. Then they changed that bill, by the Vinson amendment which permitted this House to amend and consider whatever legislation the commission brought in. That was a great victory too, and while I could well have afforded to stop then for the major victory had been won, I disagreed with the 18½-year provision and the incompleteness of the bill, and what I regarded as an improper joinder of bills. Now it is a choice between a straight outright draft bill as it has been carefully amended by this House, after the House has worked its will on the substitute, and on the other hand the bill that the committee has brought in and amended under great pressure. If my substitute is defeated, then you will have to start all over again fighting on the committee bill. I think in my heart that win, lose, or draw, I have at least made some contribution toward provoking one of the finest debates it has been my pleasure to observe in the House of Representatives and in forcing a change in the bill so that the House and not a commission appointed by the President will write and pass on the legislation. The finest relations have obtained between the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, for whom I have great respect, and

myself, because I am sure the gentleman respects me likewise. We both entered into the perfection of this substitute bill with the sincere desire to give to the House the best possible outright straight draft bill. If we turn this down in this hour of great confusion which exists in the United States, and which all of us regret, then the news will go out to the country that we are not even together on a draft bill. If the news would go out tonight that the substitute draft bill is passed unanimously, that would be the finest news which could possibly go out to the American people. We are accused of being in such confusion—although they do not know whom to accuse—yet, we are accused of being in great confusion. If this substitute bill was adopted tonight, the news would go out to the American people that the United States House of Representatives is together. When the vote is taken on this bill when we return to the House, if it is adopted here, I do not believe there will be five nays. There was only one last time, and that Member is not here.

When the universal military training bill is considered, which the Armed Services Committee could have brought into this House, I would like from the bottom of my heart to see it given very delicate treatment. I would like to see the Committee on Education and Labor given an opportunity to make some contribution to the bill that is going to affect, more than any other piece of legislation on which you will ever cast a vote, the youth of this country. It will affect the schools and the school children, the young men who are coming on. We cannot afford to fail to recognize the value of the educational institutions of this country. We cannot overlook that fact. Yet in this proposal, S. 1, I challenge any man to get up here and explain it. What assurance do we have that these things will be given consideration. I do not know how long it will take this House to dissect it and amend it and try to approve it, if this substitute is voted down.

I am not an obstructionist in this House. I have enough to do in my office. I do not have any 18-year-old boys or any boy younger than that. I have one son older, and he is in uniform in this war today. Who am I to disarm Uncle Sam or decrease the chances of my only boy coming back home? God knows no man has ever stood in the well of this House with a more sincere desire to make his Nation strong and keep it strong, to preserve its every institution and its every tradition. If I am wrong, I wish to assure you that my every effort and move is prompted by my sincere love of my country and our American way of life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the Barden amendment. I believe it will furnish all the manpower necessary and is to be preferred over the bill as reported out by the Armed Services Committee. I also voted for the Sutton amendment which in substance would have set up a civilian commission to study universal military training and report back to Congress for its consideration. What I intend to do on final passage will be determined by the final form of the bill after all amendments have been considered to the original bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has just made one of the most illuminating speeches on the pending subject that has been made during the nearly 2 weeks debate on this bill. When my thinking on the pending bill began to bend toward the position so well espoused by the gentleman from North Carolina I was made to examine and reexamine the premises on which I was reaching a position in support of his contentions since they are in direct contradiction to the position so ably espoused by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] who is the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and who is the highly respected dean of the Georgia delegation in this House. Anytime I find myself in opposition to the position of this great Georgian I am made to suspect the fallacy of my position. Suspect though it may be, upon due and prayerful consideration, I am persuaded to believe that the position of the gentleman from North Carolina should prevail in this controversy.

Mr. Chairman, I have never been one to shirk my responsibility by delegating it to some other agency. Neither have I been one to believe in attaining my point by subterfuge. In my opinion, it is the constitutional responsibility of this Congress, composed of the duly elected Representatives of the people, to write whatever legislation that is written on the subject of military service to this country. And I honestly believe that the pending bill, even with the concessions that have been made, is a cowardly attempt to escape the real issues and delegate their determination to some commission within the executive department. I also believe that any plan for universal military training should be allowed to stand or fall on its own merit or demerit. I do not believe that any form of UMT should be tied on to a bill which simply calls for an extension of the Selective Service Act. This is dishonesty in its most reprehensible form and should not be tolerated. We should separate the two issues and then the House should write the kind and type of UMT plan it sees fit to write.

If the emergency is as immediate in all of its implications as has been suggested here on this floor then the draft is

the most expeditious and effective means of securing the manpower to meet the emergency. If it is not immediate then some form of UMT is in order but not the kind of complete military control of the youth of this Nation that has been proposed by certain committees and supported by certain pressure groups in this Nation. I certainly support the avowed purpose of UMT insofar as universal responsibility for service is concerned but I take definite exception to the theory that would hold millions of American boys to the task of learning the arts of war as they were conceived to be in order to fight World War I or World War II. Victorious war in this advanced technological age will not countenance emphasis on training the physical man to the exclusion of training the mental man. The manual of arms might have been all right for fighting World War I but training in the physical sciences is much more important in preparing for world war III.

The military is not capable of giving to the youth of this land the type of training that is needed for world war III without the help of the educational institutions of this country; therefore, I feel that any type of universal military training devised for the youth of this land should be integrated with the academic training that is given by our civilian educational institutions.

The emphasis that is given in the committee bill, which the Barden bill seeks to amend, to the work of a Commission will doubtless place the major emphasis on the physical military aspects of training since two members of the Commission will be wedded to the military concept to start with and it will be relatively easy for the Military Establishment to impress its will on one of the civilian members of the Commission.

If we are to survive in this atomic age we must place the emphasis on attaining and maintaining command of the air all over the world and this cannot be done by training all the youth in the arts of war that were standard operating procedure in World War I. In view of this reality let us proceed to extend the draft as is advocated by the Barden bill and then proceed to write legislation that will place universal responsibility on all citizens and make sensible plans to train them for discharging this responsibility.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the vote on this defense measure is one that is most difficult. Certainly volumes could be written concerning the mistakes of the Truman administration for getting the country into the predicament that we find ourselves. The fact remains our country has to be defended.

I do want to make my position clear upon some of the votes on which there will be no roll call. I am for the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWLE], which would deny to the President the right to send troops

to Europe without the consent of Congress. Much of our trouble today is because of the actions taken by the occupant of the White House. I do not propose to give him more power.

I am for the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], which would have confined the bill to an extension of the Selective Service Act. If a program for military training is to be considered by the Congress, that bill should be written by the Congress itself. I do not favor the granting of power to the President to select a commission to prepare the legislation for a training program.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I know of no debate that has occurred in this great body since I have had the honor and privilege of being a Member, which has shown more inconsistency and has created more enigmas in the thinking of the Members.

I have the greatest respect and admiration for all of the Members of the House of Representatives. Possibly there is something in what the great essayist, Ralph Waldo Emerson, said some years ago, that "inconsistency is the hobgoblin of a small mind." Possibly he was pointing his finger at the debate which has transpired in this body in the last several days.

Let us, if we can, coolly examine some of the inconsistent positions which have been taken by the Members on both sides of the aisle.

Today the country is being subjected to a heated debate involving a great general. I have no way of knowing who is right or wrong on the foreign-policy question involved. Although I firmly believe, of course, in the civilian control of the military.

But let us examine those policy recommendations in the light of the Barden substitute now before this body; let us pose the question: How can you support the policy recommendations of General MacArthur and at the same time support the substitute bill of my friend from North Carolina?

What has General MacArthur been saying? As I understand, his thesis has been that we must employ the forces of Chiang Kai-shek and that we must use the American Air Force to bomb the China coast. But the forces of Chiang Kai-shek cannot be moved from Formosa to the mainland of China without employing the American Navy.

Mr. JUDD. Who says that? Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. No; I refuse to yield at this time.

Mr. JUDD. I just wanted to know where the gentleman got that information.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I may say to the gentleman that I do not see how

they can move troops to the mainland without the use of the American Navy or merchant marine; they have no shipping available.

The point that I am making is that whether MacArthur be right or wrong his program envisages an expansion of the Armed Forces, not a contraction thereof. He might very well be wrong; he might be right in his central thesis, but in any event it does not mean adopting the Barden substitute which has come here in contravention of the work of one of the most distinguished groups of this body, the House Committee on Armed Services. So I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that it is the height of inconsistency to support the policy of MacArthur on the one hand and at the same time in the same breath stand on this floor and support the bill of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

That is not all the inconsistency about this thing. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] made his argument the other day.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I refuse to yield. My friend from Missouri has already made several speeches on this bill.

The gentleman from North Carolina based his plea on the fact that the military should not have control over the civilian functions of Government. I agree with the gentleman. But this bill, as I understand it, does not propose such control. I hope that the substitute of my friend from North Carolina will be defeated.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire recognition in opposition to the motion?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman of the committee is entitled to recognition in opposition to a motion to strike out the enacting clause of his bill, if he wishes it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Where does the minority fit into that picture?

The CHAIRMAN. On a motion to strike out the enacting clause of a bill certainly the chairman of the committee is entitled to recognition in opposition to the motion if he claims that right.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Chair if he will hear me?

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I make the point that the gentleman from Louisiana moved to strike out the enacting clause which was a subterfuge to get 5 minutes to speak against the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman could have made a point of order at that time if he had wanted to. He did not do so.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I was fair. I wanted the gentleman to get the 5 minutes, if he so desired. Now the gentleman from Georgia is claiming 5 minutes to oppose it and he is getting 5 minutes for the same purpose.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels it is eminently fair that when a motion is made to strike out the enacting clause of a bill the chairman in charge of that bill on the floor should be allowed time to speak in opposition to that motion if he claims it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. From time immemorial it has been the rule to give the opposing party 5 minutes in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not know of any such provision where the pending motion is to strike the enacting clause.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to suggest that the committee vote down the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana to strike out the enacting clause, and then let us vote on the Barden substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] is recognized to close debate on the Barden amendment.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a rather peculiar position here this afternoon, in opposing my good friend who has offered a substitute for the committee bill. But I believe I am on sound ground.

May I call the attention of the Members at the present time that it is not only the issue of UMT that has been discussed so much here on the floor of this House that is involved in this substitute measure. The committee, in my opinion, went into this matter of the number of men from 19 to 26 and from 18½ to 26 as carefully and had as accurate figures as it could possibly get and they are accurate.

I have charts here and anyone can look over and study the charts we have. The gentleman from North Carolina has said there is a state of confusion existing. This is exactly what would happen under his amendment changing the 26 to 24 months. We would immediately have to call sooner than we would have under the 26 months' provision 75,000 more men. If we adopt the other amendment to the Selective Service Act he will knock out 254,000 more men, a total of over 300,000.

Mr. Chairman, we all realize the defense effort that we have got to put forth this spring and this summer because I believe that every Member of the House knows that defending this country is a matter of importance immediately and that the next 6 months mean so much to us.

You are going to necessarily have to defer more men for industry and farming if you expect to get production and food than we have deferred presently which is around 200,000. At the present time 150,000 are deferred for farming and more than 60,000 deferred for industry. We expect that number to be doubled. They are coming out of our barrel of 1,200,000 men. How did we get these 1,200,000 men? We got 600,000 of them by going back to the physical standards of 1945 when we were at the lowest point in the barrel of the manpower of this country, and we know we are going to lose a large percentage of those; we just cannot help it because, to begin with, many of them are physically handicapped. So, we are going to wind up, if you do not watch yourselves, with having to call all married men and veterans in the age groups from 19 to 26, and find yourself in the position where you are going to be called back here, because you will not have the necessary manpower to support your Armed Forces. Suppose we move this up to 4,000,000 men. We are preparing now on at least a 3,500,000 basis at the present time. So, it is not just UMT in this bill that the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] affects, but it is the present status of your manpower and the Draft Act, which he himself says is necessary. I have always been for a UMT plan. I think a long range military policy is important to this country. I guess most of the Members the other day received a letter from a great statesman who served on that side of the aisle in former days, Mr. Walsworth. I hope that if you did not read that letter, you will read it, because it is the opinion of one of the greatest statesmen that ever served in this House, who at all times during the last war expressed a sound view. Some Members who have spoken on this measure have been shedding crocodile tears about the mothers of this country. The mothers of this country are far more brave than the timid men. If they were not, the human race would have become extinct long ago. If we were to adopt this substitute measure, in my opinion, it would be good news to the Kremlin. So I ask you to vote this substitute down and pass the committee bill.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BENDER moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the motion that the bill has not been changed since the last motion of that character was submitted, and therefore the motion is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KILDAY and Mr. BARDEN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 140, noes 232.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXCLUSION OF INCOME FROM DISCHARGE OF INDEBTEDNESS FROM GROSS INCOME

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2416) relating to exclusion from gross income of income from discharge of indebtedness.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes from the Committee on Ways and Means by unanimous vote. It is a bill which we have heretofore passed for a 1-year period only.

This bill proposes to make permanent one section of the bill and to extend the other section for a period of 3 years. The bill is an amendment to section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code, and provides for amending sections 9 and 10 of that act. It relates to the purchase by corporations of their own bonds, and where the bonds are sold for an additional amount, that shall be taken into consideration for taxation purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 (b) (9) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to income from discharge of indebtedness) is hereby amended by changing the comma following the words "the Revenue Act of 1939" in the last sentence of said section to a period and striking the remainder of the sentence.

SEC. 2. Section 22 (b) (10) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to income from discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation) is hereby amended by changing

the date "December 31, 1951" at the end of said section to "December 31, 1954."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "amended", insert "effective with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1950, (1) by striking out 'if the taxpayer makes and files at the time of filing the return, in such manner as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, by regulations prescribes, its consent' and inserting in lieu thereof 'if the taxpayer, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary by regulations prescribes, makes and files its consent', and (2)."

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, section 22 (b) (9) of the Internal Revenue Code provides for exclusion from taxable income of so-called gain realized by a corporation upon the purchase of its bonds at less than par, provided the corporation agrees to a reduction in the basis of its assets for depreciation and other income tax purposes by the amount of the gain so excluded from taxable income. As now written this section will expire December 31, 1951. H. R. 2416 would remove the time limitation, and thus make this section a permanent feature of the code.

Section 22 (b) (10) provides for exclusion from taxable income of so-called gain attributable to the modification or cancellation of any indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a judicial reorganization. This section will also expire according to its present terms December 31, 1951. H. R. 2416 would extend the expiration date to December 31, 1954.

SECTION 22 (B) (9)

Section 22 (b) (9) was first added to the Internal Revenue Code by section 215 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1939, and amended to its present form by section 114 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1942. The effect of the section is merely to spread theoretical income over a period of time through reduced allowances for depreciation and for loss upon disposition of the property. At the same time, it removes an impediment to strengthening the financial position of a corporation through debt reduction.

Ten years of experience with the section, as a temporary part of the code and subject to time limitation which was last year extended for the sixth time, has demonstrated conclusively that the section serves a useful purpose. Current figures as to reduction of railroad indebtedness through the operation of section 22 (b) (9) are not available. Illustrative of the effect of the section in operation, however, are figures submitted to Chairman DOUGHTON of the Ways and Means Committee of the House by the Association of American Railroads September 27, 1945, which showed that under section 22 (b) (9) bonds in the face amount of \$484,745,136 were retired in

the period 1942-44, inclusive, with a corresponding interest reduction of \$20,956,-214 per annum. Sight will not be lost of the benefit to the tax revenue consequent upon the reduction of fixed charges.

Indication of the benefit to the tax revenue of reduction of indebtedness is found in the fact appearing from the monthly comment on transportation statistics, released by the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics of the Interstate Commerce Commission July 13, 1950, namely: Long term debt of class I line-haul steam railways was reduced from \$10,500,000,000 on December 31, 1943, to \$9,200,000,000 on the corresponding date in 1949, or \$1,300,000,000. Annual interest accruals declined from \$443,400,000 in 1943 to \$321,200,000 in 1949, or \$122,200,000. This includes reductions owing to changes in interest rates, but a large part thereof is to be attributed to debt retirement.

Seldom has the Congress passed so often upon the advisability of and need for a particular provision of the tax law. No abuse of the section has appeared, if indeed any is possible. No loopholes or evasive possibilities have resulted from the continuation of the section in the law. As stated, the section operates to enhance the tax revenue as a result of reduction of the taxpayer's fixed charges. It seems clear that section 22 (b) (9) should be made a permanent part of the Internal Revenue Code, as provided in H. R. 2416.

SECTION 22 (B) (10)

Section 22 (b) (10) of the code provides for excluding from taxable income so-called gain attributable to the modification or cancellation of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a judicial reorganization through continuance of the original corporation.

Section 22 (b) (10) was first enacted as a part of the Revenue Act of 1942. At the same time, sections 112 (b) (9) and 113 (a) (20), applicable to reorganization through a new corporation, were added to the code.

These several provisions are correlated and have the effect of placing on a uniform basis tax-wise railroad reorganizations whether accomplished through the medium of a new corporation or through continuance of the original corporation. However, in spite of this correlation, section 22 (b) (10) was made subject to time limitation while the provisions relative to reorganizations through the medium of a new corporation were enacted without time limitation.

At the time of the original adoption of section 22 (b) (10) in 1942, some 31 class I railroads, operating 65,395 miles of road, were in reorganization. Appendix E to the Sixty-fourth Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission (November 1, 1950), a copy of which is attached, shows that during the period covered by that report—November 1, 1949, to October 31, 1950—20 railroad companies were in process of reorganization. Of this number, nine are railroads of class I, with an aggregate mileage of only 13,250.

One of the principal railroads in trusteeship in 1942 whose reorganization has not been completed is the Missouri Pacific System, comprising more than 9,000 miles of road. Because of the complexities of this system and the numerous conflicting creditor and equity interests involved, plans of reorganization approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission became involved in litigation. Such delays in effecting railroad reorganizations are not attributable to the debtor corporation but are due to the consideration and protection required to be given at every stage of the proceeding to the rights of conflicting interests. Such delays are unavoidable. There is no sound reason why the Missouri Pacific System, for example, or the Wisconsin Central Railway Co., or any of the smaller roads whose reorganization has been delayed, should be denied the benefits of section 22 (b) (10).

The practical effect of the section is to eliminate discrimination against the railroads. Other business enterprises are generally able to effect their reorganizations by a transfer of the properties to a new corporation and this method of reorganization is tax-free under permanent provisions of the code, sections 112 (b) (10) and 113 (a) (22). Railroad corporations which, for reasons unrelated to taxation (such, for example, as the preservation of charter rights), may be required to reorganize through the medium of the existing corporation, are in danger of discrimination through their inability to meet the requirements for tax-free treatment under the permanent provisions of law, unless section 22 (b) (10) is continued in the code. Accordingly, H. R. 2416 provides for a 3-year extension of section 22 (b) (10), which should afford an ample period for completion of the pending railroad reorganizations.

Mileage of line-haul steam railroads operated by receivers or trustees at various dates

| Year ¹ | Miles of road operated by receivers at close of year | Miles of road operated by trustees at close of year | Miles of road operated by both receivers and trustees at close of year | Total miles of road operated at close of year (all line-haul companies) | Percent of total mileage operated by receivers or trustees |
|-------------------|--|---|--|---|--|
| 1895..... | 37,855.80 | ----- | 37,855.80 | 177,746 | 21.30 |
| 1900..... | 4,177.91 | ----- | 4,177.91 | 192,556 | 2.17 |
| 1905..... | 795.82 | ----- | 795.82 | 216,974 | .37 |
| 1910..... | 5,257.03 | ----- | 5,257.03 | 240,831 | 2.18 |
| 1915..... | 30,223.05 | ----- | 30,223.05 | 257,569 | 11.73 |
| 1920..... | 16,290.17 | ----- | 16,290.17 | 259,941 | 6.27 |
| 1925..... | 18,686.99 | ----- | 18,686.99 | 258,631 | 7.23 |
| 1930..... | 9,486.28 | ----- | 9,486.28 | 260,440 | 3.64 |
| 1935..... | 15,920.00 | 52,425.00 | 68,345.00 | 252,930 | 27.02 |
| 1940..... | 11,658.00 | 63,612.00 | 75,270.00 | 245,740 | 30.63 |
| 1945..... | 5,088.00 | 34,626.00 | 39,714.00 | 239,438 | 16.59 |
| 1949..... | 686.00 | 11,993.00 | 12,679.00 | 237,564 | 5.34 |

¹ As of June 30, 1895, to 1915, inclusive. As of Dec. 31, 1920, to 1949, inclusive.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2416 provides for the permanent enactment of section 22 (b) (9) of the Internal Revenue Code and for the extension of section 22 (b) (10) of the code for a 3-year period. Under present law,

APPENDIX E SIXTY-FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT, INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION Railroad companies in reorganization (or receivership) proceedings

| Proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act: | Miles of line operated |
|---|---------------------------|
| Boston & Providence Railroad Corp. ¹ | ----- |
| Boston Terminal Co..... | 13 |
| Florida East Coast Railway Co. ² | 571 |
| Georgia, Florida & Alabama Railroad Co. ³ | ----- |
| Huntington & Broad Top Mountain Railroad & Coal Co., The..... | 77 |
| Lackawanna & Wyoming Valley Railroad Co..... | 19 |
| Long Island Railroad Co., The..... | 364 |
| Meridian & Bigbee River Railway Co..... | 50 |
| Missouri Pacific Railroad System..... | 9,805 |
| New Jersey & New York Railroad Co..... | 38 |
| New York, Ontario & Western Railway Co..... | 514 |
| New York, Susquehanna & Western Railroad Co. ⁴ | 120 |
| Rutland Railroad Co..... | 407 |
| Wisconsin Central Railway Co. ⁵ | ----- |
| Wyoming Railway Co..... | 29 |
| Receivership proceedings: | |
| Georgia & Florida Railroad..... | 408 |
| Rio Grande & Southern Railroad Co., The..... | 172 |
| Smoky Mountain Railroad..... | 31 |
| Tallulah Falls Railway Co..... | 57 |
| Waco, Beaumont, Trinity & Sabine Railway Co..... | 18 |

¹ Owned mileage 64. Leased to Old Colony Railroad Co.; operated by New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. Collateral proceedings pending.

² District court disapproved Commission plan. ICC proceeding reopened.

³ Owned mileage 133. Operated by Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co.

⁴ Court failed to approve plan. ICC proceeding reopened.

⁵ Owned mileage 898. Operated by Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railroad Co. Proceeding reopened after approval of Commission, hearing completed.

both of these provisions would expire automatically on December 31, 1951.

Section 1 of the bill amends section 22 (b) (9) of the code to make such temporary provision permanent. Section 22 (b) (9) excludes from gross income, in the case of a corporation, the amount of income attributable to the discharge of indebtedness evidenced by a bond, debenture, note, certificate, or other evidence of indebtedness. The exclusion is applicable only if the corporation consents to a reduction in the basis

of its properties under section 113 (b) (3) in accordance with the regulations then in effect. The reduction of basis under section 113 (b) (3) is in an amount equal to the income excluded under section 22 (b) (9). In the event an amount is excluded from gross income under these provisions, an adjustment is made for unamortized premium or unamortized discount on the discharged obligation.

The bill, as amended in committee, makes a technical amendment to section 22 (b) (9) to allow for greater flexibility as to the time for filing the required consent to a reduction of basis. Under the present law, the taxpayer must file its consent with its return for the taxable year. The bill amends the section to provide that the consent shall be filed at such time as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. Under this amendment, the Department could continue to require that the consent be filed with the return in the ordinary case, but might make provision for filing of the consent at a later date in appropriate hardship cases. Your committee has provided that this amendment shall be effective with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1950.

Section 2 of the bill extends for an additional 3-year period the exclusion provided for railroad corporations under section 22 (b) (10) of the code. Section 22 (b) (10) provides that the amount of income attributable to the discharge of any indebtedness of a railroad corporation, as defined in section 77 (m) of the National Bankruptcy Act, shall be excluded to the extent that such income is deemed to have been realized by a modification or cancellation of indebtedness pursuant to an order of the court in a receivership proceeding or a proceeding under section 77 of the National Bankruptcy Act. Unlike section 22 (b) (9), section 22 (b) (10) does not require a reduction in the basis of the taxpayer's properties as a condition to the exclusion of the income. The extension of the expiration date of section 22 (b) (10) by the bill is to December 31, 1954.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 113 (b) (1) (B) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3168) to amend section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain in a few words what this bill does?

Mr. CAMP. This bill also comes from the Ways and Means Committee with unanimous approval, and is a bill to correct an injustice in the consideration of depreciation and to correct a decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the *Virginian Hotel* against *Helvering*. This bill is an interpretation of an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code, dated 1932, whereby a method of calculating depreciation was considered. This allows any taxpayer who has made an error in his depreciation claims, which error has not resulted in a benefit to him in the way of taxation and made no difference to the Government or to himself, to go back and correct that error. But the bill has been amended, and there are amendments to consider. He can only go back to December 31, 1947.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subparagraph (1) (B) of section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, entitled "Adjusted Basis," is amended by inserting after the word "allowed" the words "as deductions in computing taxable net income and resulting in a reduction of the taxpayer's taxes" to cause the first sentence thereof to read as follows:

"(B) in respect of any period since February 28, 1913, for exhaustion, wear and tear, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion, to the extent allowed as deductions in computing taxable net income and resulting in a reduction of the taxpayer's taxes (but not less than the amount allowable) under this act or prior income tax laws."

(b) The amendments made by this act shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1938.

(c) For the purposes of the Revenue Act of 1932 and all subsequent revenue acts, the amendments made to the Internal Revenue Code by section (a) of this act shall be effective as if they were a part of each such revenue act on the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "taxable."
On page 2, line 2, strike out "taxable."
On page 2, line 5, strike out "act" and insert in lieu thereof "chapter."

On page 2, line 6, strike out "amendments" and insert in lieu thereof "amendment."

On page 2, line 8, strike out "1938" and insert in lieu thereof "1947."

On page 2, lines 9 through 13, strike out subsection (c).

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to eliminate the inequity resulting from the 5 to 4 decision of the Supreme Court in *Virginian Hotel Corp. of Lynchburg* against *Commissioner*. That decision construes section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code of the Revenue Act of 1932 and succeed-

ing revenue acts. As there construed, section 113 (b) (1) (B) requires that the basis of property be reduced not only by the depreciation allowable in prior years, but also by any depreciation in excess of that allowable erroneously claimed on a tax return and not corrected by the Commissioner even where there was a loss without the erroneous deduction and such deduction did not reduce taxes. The decision has been followed in a number of cases in which certiorari has been denied by the Supreme Court—see *Bank of America National Trust, etc. v. United States* (168 F. (2d) 399, cert. den., 335 U. S. 827); *Commerce Company v. United States* (171 F. (2d) 189, cert. den., 336 U. S. 972); *Piedmont Cotton Mills v. Commissioner* (177 F. (2d) 148; cert. den., 339 U. S. 919); and *Blackhawk-Perry Corporation v. Commissioner* (182 F. (2d) 319, cert. den., 340 U. S. 875).

H. R. 3168 makes it clear for all years beginning after December 31, 1947, that in computing income and taxes for such years the basis of property held shall not be reduced by any depreciation in excess of that allowable shown on returns for prior years except to the extent that such excess depreciation has resulted in a reduction of taxes in such prior years and the statute of limitations has barred the collection of the taxes properly due.

H. R. 3168 makes no change in the law with reference to the deduction of allowable depreciation. The law has been, and will remain, that depreciation which was allowable in a prior year must be deducted in computing basis, even though in the light of later events it develops that the depreciation in such prior year was actually less than it was then properly estimated to be. And this is true regardless of whether depreciation allowable in such prior year had any effect on tax liability in the prior year. Such depreciation must be deducted even though there was no income against which it could be offset.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Your committee believes that the result brought about by the Supreme Court's interpretation of section 113 (b) (1) (B) in the *Virginian Hotel* case is clearly unjust and contrary to the purpose of Congress in enacting the provision. The result is out of keeping with one of the basic principles of our income tax laws which requires that income and taxes for each year be computed without regard to harmless errors in prior returns which had no effect on tax liability. Your committee is informed that, except for this single situation of excess depreciation, where a contrary result follows from the Supreme Court's misinterpretation of the clear intent of section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the 1932 and following acts, there is not now and there has never been any situation under our Federal income tax laws where a taxpayer is compelled to overstate his income in a current year on account of a harmless error in a prior return. Congress in 1932 was not requested to adopt such a rule, and your committee feels that no just basis for such a rule could be found. This bill makes it clear that no such rule

shall apply for years beginning after December 31, 1947.

It is clear from the legislative history of section 113 (b) (1) (B), as well as from the inherent injustice of the rule, that Congress did not intend any such result as was reached in the *Virginian Hotel* case.

The Revenue Act of 1928 provided that basis of property should be reduced by the depreciation allowable in respect of such property under that act and prior income tax laws; that is, by the amount properly deductible in prior years. Congress became fearful that this specific provision to the effect that basis should be reduced only by the depreciation allowable would make it possible for a taxpayer, who had reduced his taxes by a claim of excessive depreciation which the Commissioner had not disturbed, to contend in later years, after the statute of limitations had barred the taxes due in earlier years, that he was required to reduce basis only by the depreciation properly deductible in prior years. This result would clearly have been inequitable. It would have permitted a taxpayer twice to reduce taxable income by the same depreciation. The statements in the House and Senate Committee reports clearly show that it was solely to avoid any possibility of this inequitable result that Congress changed the law in 1932 to require that basis be reduced not only by the depreciation allowable in prior years, but also by any depreciation deduction in excess of that amount of which taxpayer had received a benefit in reduced taxes. The language used was that basis should be reduced by the amount "allowed—but not less than the amount allowable"—under that and prior income tax laws. Your committee does not believe that Congress ever anticipated that the language used could be construed to require that basis be reduced by any amounts of depreciation claimed on a return and not disturbed by the Commissioner, even though the amount was admittedly in excess of that allowable and did not result in any reduction in taxes.

The glaring injustice of the rule of the *Virginian Hotel* decision is strikingly illustrated in the case of *Blackhawk-Perry* against Commissioner, *supra*. But the fundamental injustice is the same in all the cases cited—that a taxpayer is bound by harmless error in prior years to overstate his income and taxes in subsequent years.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker the purpose of H. R. 3168 is to correct a needless and unintended injustice in our tax laws which was brought about by the 5 to 4 decision of the Supreme Court in *Virginian Hotel Corporation v. Commissioner* (319 U. S. 523). The decision has been followed in a number of other recent cases in which certiorari has been denied by the Supreme Court—see *Bank*

of America National Trust, etc. v. United States (168 F. (2d) 399, cert. den., 335 U. S. 827) *Commerce Company v. United States* (171 F. (2d) 189, cert. den., 336 U. S. 972); *Piedmont Cotton Mills v. Commissioner* (177 F. (2d) 148, cert. den., 339 U. S. 919); and *Blackhawk-Perry Corporation v. Commissioner* (182 F. (2d) 319, cert. den., 340 U. S. 875).

The effect of the rule established in the *Virginian Hotel* case is to require a taxpayer to overstate his income and overpay his taxes in later years because of a harmless error in claiming excessive depreciation on a return in an earlier year during which the taxpayer had a net loss even without the deduction of the excessive depreciation and consequently received no benefit from his mistake. Although the error in the earlier return did not result in any reduction of the taxpayer's tax liability, the *Virginian Hotel* case doctrine binds the taxpayer to that error for future years. There is no precedent in the entire history of our Federal income tax laws for compelling a taxpayer to overstate his income in a current year on account of a harmless error in a prior return.

To correct this incongruous and patently unfair result, H. R. 3168 provides for all years beginning after December 31, 1947, that in computing income for such years the basis of property held shall not be reduced by any depreciation occurring in prior years except to the extent of the depreciation allowable under chapter 1 of the code or prior income-tax laws, and to the further extent of any depreciation in excess of that allowable which under chapter I or prior income-tax laws has been allowed as deductions in computing taxable net income and resulting in a reduction of taxpayers' taxes. This is what was intended by Congress as the legislative history of the amendment in the 1932 act dealing with this problem clearly shows. Briefly summarized, the legislative history shows that in the law prior to the Revenue Act of 1932 Congress provided that basis of property should be reduced by the depreciation allowable in respect of such property under that act and prior income-tax laws—that is, by the amount properly deductible in prior years. The Congress became fearful, however, that this specific provision that basis be reduced only by the depreciation properly deductible would make it possible for a taxpayer, who had reduced his taxes by a claim of excessive depreciation which the Commissioner of Internal Revenue had not disturbed, to contend in later years, after the statute of limitations had barred the taxes due in earlier years, that he was required to reduce basis only by the depreciation properly deductible in prior years. This result would clearly have been inequitable because it would have permitted a taxpayer to reduce his taxable income twice by the same depreciation. To avoid any possibility of this inequitable advantage to the taxpayer, Congress changed the provision so as to require that basis be reduced not only by the amount allowable but also by any deduction in excess of that amount which tax-

payer had received as benefit in reduced taxes. The language used was that basis should be reduced by the amount allowed—but not less than the amount allowable—under that and prior income-tax laws. The Commissioner for some inexplicable reason construed this language to require that basis be reduced by any amounts of depreciation claimed on a return and not disturbed by the Commissioner, even though the amount was admittedly in excess of that allowable and did not result in any reduction of taxes since no taxes were due in any event. The Commissioner's contention was sustained by the Supreme Court in the *Virginian Hotel Corp.* case, despite the clear intent of the Congress to the contrary.

The result reached in the *Virginian Hotel* case is incongruous, as Chief Justice Stone said in his dissenting opinion. He there pointed out that it is out of keeping with one of the basic principles of our income tax laws which requires that the income and taxes for each year be computed without regard to errors in prior returns, where the errors in the earlier returns had no effect on tax liability. This bill makes it clear that no such rule shall apply for at least the years beginning after December 31, 1947. As introduced, however, H. R. 3168, and a similar bill which I introduced, would have corrected the injustice entirely for all open years—that is years which were not closed by the statute of limitations or for some other reason, and I hope that when this bill is acted upon by the other body it will reach the conclusion that the injustice of the rule established by the *Virginian Hotel* case should be fully corrected.

The present amendment leaves the law with reference to the deduction of allowable depreciation as it has been. Depreciation which was allowable in a prior year must be deducted in computing basis, even though in the light of later events it develops that the depreciation taking place was actually less than it was then properly estimated to be. And this is true regardless of whether the depreciation allowable had any effect on tax liability in the prior year.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND SECTION 10 OF PUBLIC LAW 378

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2654) to amend section 10 of Public Law 378, Eighty-first Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, as amended, H. R. 2654 extends until

January 1, 1952, the period during which a claim for a refund may be filed under section 939 of the Internal Revenue Code. This section, which was added by section 10 (a) of Public Law 378 of the Eighty-first Congress, allows an exemption from the additional estate tax for the estates of citizens or residents of the United States dying on or after December 7, 1941, and before January 1, 1947, while in active service in the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations, if the decedent was killed in action or died as a result of wounds or other injuries, or of disease, suffered while in line of duty by reason of a hazard to which he was subjected as incident to his military or naval service. Subsection (b) of section 10 extended to October 25, 1950, the time during which claim for refund of an overpayment resulting from the application of section 10 might be made if such refund was prevented on October 25, 1949—the date of enactment of Public Law 378—or within 1 year thereafter by the operation of any law or rule of law—other than section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to compromises.

The attention of the Committee on Ways and Means has been called to the fact that in some cases estates of deceased servicemen have not had an opportunity within the prescribed time to invoke the benefits intended by the Congress under section 10 of Public Law 378, and your committee believes therefore that it is only fair to permit these estates to have additional time within which to file claims for refund. Since no interest is permitted on any refund and since the number of estates which have not been able to file timely claims is small, the loss of revenue will be inconsequential.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code," approved October 25, 1949 (Public Law 378), is hereby amended by striking out "within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act" and inserting in lieu thereof "prior to January 1, 1952."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "by striking out 'within 1 year from such date' and inserting in lieu thereof 'at any time prior to January 1, 1952', and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES v. WALTER E. BREHM

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read by the Clerk:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1951.
The Honorable The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia I have received a subpoena duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before said Court as a witness in the case of the *United States v. Walter E. Brehm* (No. 1864-59, criminal docket), and to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

The rules and practice of the House of Representatives indicates that the Clerk may not either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpoena duces tecum produce such papers without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of certain of the documents and papers requested without such consent.

The subpoena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES v. WALTER E. BREHM, No. 1864-59

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO RALPH R. ROBERTS, Clerk of the House of Representatives, Capitol Building, and bring with you:

1. Original or certified copy of Clerk to Members (clerk-hire allowance) dated January 9, 1945, designating Clara Soliday to be a clerk in the discharge of the official and representative duties of Walter E. Brehm, Member of Congress, Eleventh District, State of Ohio, effective January 10, 1945, to receive compensation at the basic rate of \$4,500 per annum, together with oath of office of said Clara Soliday dated January 9, 1945.

2. The original or certified copy of Card No. 1, disbursing office, House of Representatives, Clara Soliday, position clerk, Walter E. Brehm, Eleventh Ohio, showing salary \$4,500 plus \$570 to July 1, 1945, then \$4,500 plus \$1,857.78 to separation on January 31, 1948.

3. Original or certified copy of clerk to Members (clerk-hire allowance) dated January 15, 1948, designating Mrs. Emma S. Craven to be a clerk in the discharge of the official and representative duties of Walter E. Brehm, Member of Congress, Eleventh District, State of Ohio, effective February 1, 1948, to receive compensation at the basic rate of \$4,500 per annum, together with the oath of office of said Emma S. Craven dated February 2, 1948.

4. Original or certified copy of Card No. 1, disbursing office, House of Representatives, Craven, Emma S., February 1, 1948, position clerk Walter E. Brehm, Eleventh, Ohio, showing salary \$4,500 plus \$1,857.78 to July 1, 1948, and \$4,500 plus \$2,157.78 to date of separation, January 2, 1949.

5. Representatives roll and oath and qualification record, or certified copies thereof, showing Walter Ellsworth Brehm, to have qualified and been a Member of the House of Representatives representing the Eleventh District, State of Ohio, in the years 1945, 1946, 1947 and 1948.

6. Original or certified copy of statement of receipts and expenditures of the Committee for the Election of Walter S. Brehm as a Representative in Congress, filed in your office on October 22, 1948.

Also original or certified copy of statement of receipts and expenditures of candidate for election as a Representative in Congress signed Walter E. Brehm and filed in your office on October 23, 1948.

Also original or certified copy of statement of receipts and expenditures of candidate for election as a Representative in Congress signed Walter E. Brehm and filed in your office on November 12, 1948.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, April 16, 1951, at 9 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness, the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 9th day of April A. D. 1951.

[SEAL] HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.
By MICHAEL JAMES SULLIVAN,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 193) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States v. Walter E. Brehm* (No. 1864-59, criminal docket), pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, a subpoena duces tecum was issued by the Chief Justice of said court and addressed to Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, requesting him to supply originals or certified copies of certain original papers in possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privilege of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the officer named in the subpoena duces tecum before mentioned, with certified copies of the documents and papers mentioned in the said subpoena, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena aforementioned.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK
OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration and ordered printed:

APRIL 11, 1951.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: That there was in progress under the provisions of the statutes a contest for a

seat in the House of Representatives from the Twelfth Congressional District of the State of Missouri in the Eighty-second Congress was made apparent by the filing in the Clerk's office of the following communications, viz:

1. On November 28, 1950, for information only, by Hon. Raymond W. Karst, of a copy of his notice of intention to contest the election of Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, returned Member from the Twelfth Congressional District of the State of Missouri.

2. On December 18, 1950, for information only, by Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, of a copy of his reply to the said notice of contest.

The Clerk would state further that it would appear that the time for taking testimony in this case has expired, and that no testimony has been received by him in this matter.

Now comes the said THOMAS B. CURTIS with a petition and motion to dismiss the proceedings instituted in this case, which, together with all papers received by the Clerk, is transmitted herewith for reference to the appropriate committee.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ACTION IS URGENT ON INDIA WHEAT BILL

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, as a fervent believer in democracy and the democratic way of life, I cannot sit back calmly and watch the specter of famine and starvation hover over 100,000,000 people in India. We speak of world peace, the brotherhood of man, universal justice and our moral obligation to humanity, but at the same time we do nothing to alleviate the hunger of our fellowmen and to prevent mass starvation of a great people.

The people of India have a very low standard of living, perhaps one of the lowest on the face of the earth. This is unfortunate in our day and age, but more unfortunate is the fact that this year India is suffering from a shortage of 6,000,000 tons of grain, which is basic in the diet of this people, and consequently even their meager subsistence is very seriously endangered.

India is purchasing 2,000,000 tons of grain in the United States and another 2,000,000 tons in other countries. Since we have a considerable surplus of wheat in this country, it was most logically suggested that we offer to India the required balance of wheat. In this way, we would have fulfilled a great humanitarian task, we would have made an important stride forward in cementing the friendship between our country and India, and we would have shown to the nations of the world how a free people enjoying the advantages of democracy and free enterprise responds to the dire calls of a distressed people.

The bill to send the necessary grain to India has been before Congress since early February and has been held up in the House Rules Committee since the beginning of March. Originally, April 1

had been set as the deadline when the first million tons is to reach India, but here it is past this deadline and we have not been given the opportunity to vote on the bill and to voice our approval of it in order to speed the grain where it is so eagerly awaited.

Let us not confuse this emergency humanitarian act with side issues and short-sighted reasoning, which have already done us great harm. It has never been the policy or tradition of the American people to deny food to a hungry, starving people anywhere in the world, and certainly this should not become our policy today at a time when Communist propaganda is ready to capitalize on our mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that if this bill were put before this House, the overwhelming majority of the Members would support it. I call upon all my colleagues in the House to raise their voice for humanity's sake and to speak up loudly enough so that the members of the Rules Committee can hear it. If no action is taken by that committee within the next few days, steps should be considered to pry loose that bill and bring it before the House for a final vote and approval.

THE LATE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago today a great human figure passed from our midst. The death of Franklin D. Roosevelt left a gaping void in the ranks of mankind, for he was a towering figure in the endless struggle for human freedom and decency. His passing filled the ordinary people of this country and the world with a deep sense of personal loss.

Why was this so? Was it because he had led the Nation out of the suffocating economic depression into which it had been plunged by irresponsibility and greed? Or was it because he had marshaled the sagging forces of liberty and steered them to triumph over tyranny in the Second World War?

These accomplishments, great as they were, do not in themselves explain the place of Franklin D. Roosevelt in our hearts. He gave us more than leadership in depression and war. Most of all, he gave us things of the spirit—a renewed faith in ourselves and in the greatness of a free society.

With the electric words, "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself," Franklin D. Roosevelt established a vital bond between himself and the ordinary people of the Nation. From then on, for more than a decade, he put into ringing language our finest hopes—the hopes that always have moved men in the eternal struggle for liberty.

In honoring the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt today, I should like to restate these hopes; we need them more

than ever in the difficult days that lie ahead. In a sentence, they are: A nation of liberty in which human beings are the masters rather than the slaves of the economic and political forces of society, and a world of dignified peace free from the stifling threat of aggression and conquest.

These aspirations may seem unattainably remote in the welter of problems now confronting us. The world is still scarred with the physical devastation of the second great war. Hunger and want have stimulated a vast unrest among millions of people in many nations. In Korea, Communist aggression has precipitated a conflict which could expand into another general war.

But we need not yield to the despair which these circumstances tend to produce. Man-made problems can be and must be made to yield to man-made solutions. The coordinated action in Korea, in the Atlantic community, and in the work of the United Nations which President Truman has done so much to encourage is evidence of what free men can do to meet the challenges of the hour.

By continuing to work constructively in this manner for peace and international progress we will not only help to forestall world war III but we will keep alive the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the hope for a better life which he expressed for all mankind.

A SALUTE TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, today is the sixth anniversary of President Truman's accession to the Presidency.

Tomorrow—when the history of this era is written—the policy of President Truman's administration will be evaluated.

The wisdom, the integrity, the success of the President's foreign policy will, I am confident, measure up to history's test.

You and I—members of our legislative halls—are in a unique position; we can simplify the historian's task by contributing something in the way of historical perspective—if we present objectively and without resort to partisan politics—our own evaluation of the President's policy and the success of that policy in the flowing current of history.

What has the President's foreign policy been?

The great foundation upon which the President's policy has been built is the achievement of world peace through active support of the United Nations.

In Asia—as well as in Europe—every action the President has taken has been within the spirit of the letter of the UN Charter.

What has the President done to implement this policy?

The record of the past 6 years speaks for itself:

The Truman doctrine of economic and military aid to Greece and Turkey which has strengthened two vital links in our chain of western defense;

The Marshall plan which in 4 years has restored economic stability to Western Europe;

The North Atlantic Pact which established a mutual defense system to defend freedom against the possibility of Russia's resorting to open conquest in Europe;

Our prompt and effective leadership in the United Nations action in Korea.

These policies give conclusive evidence that in joining the United Nations, we have done and shall continue to do all within our power to achieve a peaceful world of freedom—based on law—through the United Nations.

These policies are not policies of appeasement; on the contrary, they are positive policies to prevent a third world war.

We have, to date, prevented full-scale war, and the President of the United States is to be congratulated for his courageous leadership in the search for an honorable and durable peace—and this does not mean peace at any price.

Let those who criticize the President's policies come forth with alternative policies. Let those Congressmen who support General MacArthur's policy to extend the war to the people of China support their beliefs by exercising their right to declare war on China.

Let them speak out as they should, but let them give us something better than war with China, something better than war with the Soviet Union.

America wants peace, President Truman wants peace. The policies of President Truman are designed to achieve peace.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the President of the United States.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, today—April 12—provides us with a good opportunity to take stock. This is the sixth anniversary of the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a man whose life and work left a lasting imprint on our Nation. During his years in the White House, he applied the fundamental principle of democracy—that government should serve all the people impartially—so successfully that we survived a great economic depression, successfully fought a major war, and laid the ground work for the great and widely distributed strength on which we depend for preservation of our national security today.

His successor, President Truman inherited the tremendous tasks of the Presidency at one of the crucial points in history. I have not agreed with the

President on certain major domestic issues, yet I do recognize and respect him as my President. His course has not been easy. Short-sighted, fearful, and selfish men have fought him and his administration at every turn. They have cried that this Nation could not possibly accept such grave responsibilities—that it should abandon the rest of the free world and turn in on itself—cowering behind its borders rather than bravely and confidently facing its problems.

It is to the eternal credit of President Truman that he has not yielded to this powerful opposition. Instead, he has followed in the great tradition of American history. Because he has had faith in the American people—he has realized and worked on the realization, that free people not only will accept the good things that freedom brings, but also will accept the work and sacrifice that the preservation of freedom demands.

There will continue as long as time lasts partisanship in Government. In this partisanship give us the courage to be fair and honorable and that we will place above person and party what is right and in the best interest of the country.

May God give to each of us the strength to do our duty not on the basis of who is right but what is right.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO HEAR GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished minority leader and former Speaker of the House has requested the Congress of the United States to hear General MacArthur in a joint session of Congress. If our present distinguished Speaker were to make a similar request, I am sure there would be no hesitancy on the part of any Member of Congress in complying with his request. We would be delighted to do so, irrespective of who that distinguished guest might be.

On the floor of the House we have heard kings, former kings, ministers, and distinguished citizens of other countries. Why do we hesitate to adopt this resolution to hear this five-star general who has played so important a part in the life of his country and in the winning of the Second World War?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 40 minutes on Monday, April 16, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the ousting of General MacArthur comes as a great shock to the American people and is causing great celebrations in Communist Russia and Socialist England.

My office has been deluged with telegrams from my people back home in the Eleventh Illinois District. My phone at home in Chicago was busy all day yesterday with people wanting my Washington address so that they could write to me. All the telegrams showed that the people were worked up to a high emotional pitch, one of the more forceful telegrams stating:

Immediately impeach the mental incompetent who is not fit to shine the boots of a great American like MacArthur.

Another telegram stated:

The dismissal of MacArthur is a combination of Truman blundering stupidity—demand his impeachment.

Yet another telegram signed by an ex-GI stated:

Have that blockhead reinstate MacArthur or we will all end up in Siberia.

I feel that this tempest stirred up by the ousting of General MacArthur is but a reflection of the worry and underlying fear of the people for the ultimate consequences to America of the Democratic administration's bungled foreign policy. The Remingtons, the Hisses, the Lattimores, the one-worlders, the Achesons, the Rosenbergs, and countless others, have caused the majority of my people in the Eleventh Illinois District to be very gravely concerned with our foreign policy and foreign-aid programs.

My constituents want our foreign policy program put on a realistic basis, with our own country's welfare to come first. The people want a firm foreign policy instead of the Truman-Acheson policy of stumbling, bumbling, and drifting. The people are tired of the dreamers' schemes of trying to save the world while we are dooming our American way of life; they want us to concentrate on working for America.

The dismissal of MacArthur has caused such a great furor because the American people have associated him with the fight against communism. President Truman was within his rights to dismiss MacArthur, yet the people know MacArthur has been able to control the communists in Japan, taking none of their "guff."

The recent events in American history have proven that the policy of Communists working in every country is to get key men in important positions and to let them do the dirty work. Alger Hiss, along with Roosevelt and Stalin at Yalta; giving away Poland and Eastern Europe; the Amerasia case which has as yet never been fully investigated; the many atom spies, and many other cases prove that our mistakes are too frequent and too consistent not to be able to discover planned designs behind the wreck-

age of our foreign program and foreign policy. In the light of the last 5 years' developments, we cannot help but believe our red-infiltrated State Department has deliberately eased us into our present world chaos. Stalin must be very happy at the success of his followers here in America.

The people are concerned because they know how the Reds and Pinks have played into Russia's hands. My people wanted no part of Korea, which President Truman has stated is a "localized" war. Yet America had more casualties during the first 9 months of the Korean War than we had during the entire first year of World War II.

After VJ-day the Russians kept marching into Korea, a land in which Americans fought to liberate the Koreans from the Japs. By treaty they remained there and split the country in two. Our State Department openly disclosed it would defend neither South Korea nor Formosa and naturally the happy Reds tried to take over, bringing us up to date in the present fiasco of indecision and treachery. Recently, Chiang Kai-shek with American trained and equipped Chinese soldiers offered to help our retreating and almost allied-abandoned soldiers in Korea and even promised to lead an invasion into China proper and again the answer is "No." We are woefully unprepared to fight Russia, and 9 months after the first shot in Korea there is virtually no defense machinery in Washington to handle a war economy. In spite of the fact Congress has voted billions for defense, manufacturers stand idle waiting for war orders. Our war preparations are moving at a slow crawl. We cannot blame our lack of proper defense, and the steps that inevitably lead to war on "ignorance" or "lack of leadership." Our plight fits the Communist pattern that succeeded in gaining control over countries now enslaved behind the iron curtain. One key man in the right position is more helpful to Stalin than a million soldiers. The Communist tactics in America work to perfection. In the meanwhile, we wonder just how long the American people will stand for traitors in the Government. When the war is declared "official"—what a farce—and any criticism of the Government then will be branded "subversive" remember the real reason for the mess we are in. The whole rotten business was maneuvered from within.

In my estimation, the people are upset about MacArthur, not because of MacArthur himself, but because of their fear for the dire results of our un-American and pro-British foreign policy.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

AMBASSADOR PATTERSON

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, the time has long since passed when the United States and other free nations can afford to appease communism, or to make any compromise whatsoever with representatives of the Communist nations behind the iron curtain. This is the simple statement of an obvious fact as far as I

am concerned, but I regret to say that some of our foreign-policy leaders have been unduly slow and apparently reluctant to recognize its basic importance.

We are living in momentous days. All around us we are witnessing manifestations of the insidious and malignant influence of communism, both inside and outside this Nation. Within our own borders in recent weeks we have witnessed the conviction of three Americans in New York in the Nation's first atomic spy trial. We have observed the convicted Alger Hiss go away to prison, and we have seen how the House Un-American Committee was responsible for the confession of another public figure, the actor Larry Parks, that he, too, was once a Communist.

The menace of communism and the firm determination of our people to combat this menace is a subject close to my heart. The only way to fight communism is to fight communism. Wherever communism exists, wherever it shows its ugly face, wherever it seeks to continue its encroachment on the rights and lives and governments of the free peoples of the world, it must be fought, face to face, directly and bluntly.

The Senate recently confirmed as the new United States Minister to Switzerland one of our foremost citizens—an American diplomat known throughout the world for his fight against communism—for fighting it directly, bluntly. I refer to Ambassador Richard C. Patterson, Jr., of New York. Ambassador Patterson is well known and well respected by business leaders in my home State of North Carolina, and particularly in my own western mountain district of the State. It was in North Carolina that Ambassador Patterson made two fine speeches in the recent crusade for freedom. He spoke at Charlotte, also at Asheville in my district, and he reported some of his own experiences in dealing with communism, first as Ambassador of the United States to Yugoslavia, and more recently as Ambassador to Guatemala. As for myself, I regret that my own personal acquaintanceship with Ambassador Patterson is limited. But I know much of his record in this country and abroad. Mr. Patterson is an able veteran of public service and of service to industry, a man outstanding in both public and private life for 30 years. I respect him, and my friends in North Carolina respect him, as a person and as a courageous statesman.

President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson are to be commended for the wisdom and the courage they have shown in assigning to one of the world's greatest listening posts, on the borders of the Communist area of domination, the diplomat who today has had more experience behind the iron curtain than any other active United States envoy. Over and above the fact that the appointment will make full use for this Nation of Ambassador Patterson's invaluable experience in the fight against world communism, the selection of this able man for the Berne post in effect gives the lie-direct to the vilification and calumny which has lately been his lot during another, and typical, Communist maneu-

ver to discredit one of this Nation's emissaries.

Mr. Speaker, this effort to blacken the name and the record of Ambassador Patterson was made in Guatemala, but it is typical of the tactics of the Soviet Union and its satellite nations. Over the years we have seen the same effort made to discredit our other envoys—in Moscow, in Warsaw, in Prague, and Budapest, and Bucharest. Without doubt, we shall see the same kind of effort made in the future against our ministers elsewhere. I hope the effort will always fail—as it has failed this time in the case of Ambassador Patterson.

THE TYPE OF DIPLOMAT THIS COUNTRY NEEDS MOST

The new Minister to Switzerland, Mr. Speaker, is to me the type of diplomat the United States needs most—the diplomat who knows what communism is and who has the will to resist it, to fight it as a cancerous growth, and to protect at all times the best interests of the United States.

Ambassador Patterson is of the same type as Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, now director of the Central Intelligence Agency but formerly a courageous Ambassador to Moscow, and as the late Lawrence Steinhardt, who also served this country in the Soviet Union prior to World War II.

Ambassador Patterson's greatest service, not only to his own country but to all the free peoples of the world, has perhaps been his plain-spoken and courageous defense of the four freedoms, his constant uphill fight against appeasement of communism. Richard Patterson knows instinctively that such appeasement can only mean decay and disintegration of our way of life. But had his belief in this certainty needed supporting evidence, Ambassador Patterson found that evidence in irresistible abundance during his years behind the iron curtain—3 years in Yugoslavia in that period when Marshal Tito was allied so closely with Moscow, the Communist line, and the Cominform.

ONLY ONE THING TO FIGHT

The western powers, the free nations of the world, today face only one life and death problem. They have only one thing to fight. That thing is communism, the cancer of civilization. To the end that communism must be stamped out as a menace to the freedom of man, we in Congress, Government officials of the executive branch, and all the people of this country, must support men of the courage, the wisdom, and the conviction of Ambassador Patterson. And I thank our Almighty Father that we have been given another opportunity to support this man.

At this point, I would like to outline briefly the background of the man of whom I speak, a man whose rise in the world has been based on sheer merit, performance, achievement; in short, on those qualities which are recognized and rewarded fully only in a land of free enterprise.

Richard C. Patterson, Jr., was born in Omaha, Nebr., and lived there until he was 21 years old. He was educated at the University of Nebraska and at the

Columbia School of Mines. He became a professional mining engineer, and rose steadily in business and industry.

Richard Patterson started at the bottom. He was a day laborer in the mines of the Black Hills of South Dakota. He worked 2 years underground on night shift forces constructing the Catskill Viaduct in New York State. He enlisted in the Army as a private and went to the Mexican border prior to World War I. In that First World War, he rose to the rank of major, and for distinguished service as administrative officer of the American commission to negotiate peace at Paris in 1918-19, was decorated by many foreign powers.

Thereafter, Ambassador Patterson remained active in the Army Reserve, as a colonel of intelligence, and his training and experience in this field were to be of invaluable aid to him in his skillful accomplishment of his future diplomatic missions.

There are other phases of the Patterson career, in and out of the Government. He served as executive vice president of the National Broadcasting Co., as Assistant Secretary of Commerce—and for a short time as Acting Secretary—under President Roosevelt, and he resigned that post to become chairman of the board of RKO. Devoting much time to those types of public service which are without remuneration, Ambassador Patterson became chairman for New York State of the defense savings committee for the sale of war bonds, and today, even as he prepares for another Government mission, he is acting as chairman of a committee of outstanding national figures named to raise \$25,000,000 to expand the facilities of American University in Washington for the training of young people for better service within the Federal Government.

BRINGING GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS TOGETHER

Ambassador Patterson's service as Assistant Secretary of Commerce was marked by a determined, and largely successful, effort to bring business and the Government closer together in those days of the late thirties when the country was just awakening to the fact that it must fight for survival.

Ambassador Patterson left this post to assume the chairmanship of the board of directors of RKO, but he was not to remain in private life. In 1944 President Roosevelt brought him back into the public service, naming him as Ambassador to Yugoslavia at a time when young King Peter was ruling that country. Ambassador Patterson stayed at his critical post through and after the revolution that brought Marshal Tito to power—and into immediate conflict with the United States.

As a diplomat under orders from the State Department, Ambassador Patterson couched his protests in blunt, plain-spoken language.

In this fashion, he spoke out to Tito and Yugoslavia against the shooting down of an American plane at the cost of the lives of five American soldiers, against the mistreatment of Catholic Archbishop Stepinac, against Yugoslav participation in the Communist guerrilla war in northern Greece, against the

kidnaping of Greek children by the guerrillas, and against the expenditures by Yugoslavia, largely for Tito's own purposes, of \$400,000,000 of UNRRA funds, made up principally of grants from the United States.

The Patterson bluntness drew fire from the appeasers within our own Government. But it also got results in a gradual shift of Tito policy. In my judgment, this fact alone backs up Ambassador Patterson's constant contention:

You can't use diplomatic language when dealing with Communists. All they understand is plain, blunt language, with force to back it up.

COMMENDATION FROM PRESIDENT TRUMAN

In 1947, Ambassador Patterson resigned as envoy to Yugoslavia to return to his own business interests in the United States, and on that occasion he received from President Truman a letter of commendation such as has been given few public servants. Mr. Truman wrote:

I am sorry to receive your letter of March 26 expressing your desire to resign as Ambassador to Yugoslavia, effective at my earliest convenience.

I quite understand the reasoning which impels it, and it is with great reluctance that I accept your resignation from the post which you have filled so capably. You have rendered services of the highest value in a time of great need. I can only reiterate what I said previously in praise of your work, that you have done a great public service. You have indeed carried out the highest tradition of this Government.

Also, I am pleased to note that I may feel free to call on you should I require your services in the future.

The President's letter speaks very strongly.

GUATEMALA, THE COMMUNIST HAVEN OF THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

The next phase of Richard Patterson's public service found him once more pitted against Communists. Just a year after his return from Yugoslavia, Ambassador Patterson was asked by President Truman to serve as Ambassador to the Central American Republic of Guatemala, then and now the Communist haven of the Western Hemisphere.

In that tiny state, a government professing to be non-Communist harbors fugitive Communists from all over Latin America, from Spain, and from other places. These Communists are known to be linked directly to Moscow. They also are known to be working for the avowed purpose of wrecking the solidarity of the nations of this hemisphere, of shutting off strategic material from the United States in event of war with the Soviet Union, and of simultaneously sabotaging inter-American economic interests in general and the Panama Canal in particular.

The adventures of Richard Patterson as Ambassador to Guatemala constitute a separate chapter of United States diplomatic history. They tell a story of personal and official resistance to Communist intrigue and chicanery, and of bluntly spoken protests against acts harmful to the United States and to United States commercial interests in Guatemala.

These protests led finally to an oral request, by the Guatemalan Government, to our State Department that Ambassador Patterson be recalled because the Guatemalan Government would no longer accept responsibility for his safety. The fact was that Ambassador Patterson's fight against the Communists had brought down threats against his life. The recall request was nothing more nor less than a horrible confession by the Government of Guatemala of the inadequacy of its own police power to control the Communist terrorists. It speaks plainly of the results of a policy of harboring and nurturing Communists, many of whom in recent years have been placed on the public payrolls of this supposedly non-Communist Guatemalan Government.

NEW YORK TIMES REPORT ON GUATEMALA

Much has been said and written of Guatemala and of Ambassador Patterson's tenure there. I believe that one of the greatest and most objective newspapers in the world is the New York Times, and I wish to quote at this time from a series of articles by Mr. Will Lissner, discussing in the New York Times in June 1950 various aspects of Central American affairs, including the situation in Guatemala. Mr. Lissner traveled extensively through the countries of Central America and did a first-hand, penetrating, and accurate reporting job which has become a bit of journalistic history. Here is the gist of Mr. Lissner's report on the Patterson case:

The full story of the affair that led Guatemala to request the recall of the United States Ambassador, Richard C. Patterson, Jr., has not been told. The State Department has suppressed important details. Foreign Minister Ismael Gonzalez Arevalo of Guatemala has given an account that does not square with the facts.

Even in Guatemala, all the details cannot be learned. But here is an account based on this reporter's investigation there.

Mr. Patterson, unlike his predecessor, Moses Kyle, was concerned when North American business interests were threatened by the Communist campaign against them. Fully aware of the seriousness of the Communist threat to continental unity, which he was able to evaluate from his previous experience in Yugoslavia, he made it his business to bring pressure of the Arevalo government to put a stop to the threat. That was bound to make him unpopular, and it did.

Not given to pretense, Mr. Patterson dealt with the Guatemalan Government in a free and easy manner, making his attitude clear and presenting accurately the feelings of his Government and countrymen. Critics in Guatemala have represented that he was direct and as frank as the rules of diplomacy permitted him to be.

PROTECTING UNITED STATES INTERESTS

But Guatemalan officials with whom the writer discussed the matter without reserve complained not about Mr. Patterson's attitude or approach but that he concerned himself with the problems of United States interests. Even President Arevalo himself considered this—the chief reason for maintaining a mission in that or any other country—interference in Guatemalan affairs.

Mr. Patterson's mission did a remarkable job in collecting information about the Communist menace. But it lacked the funds and the personnel, because of inadequate support and underestimation of the seriousness of Communist intentions in Washing-

ton, to gather that detailed information about the inner situation of the Communist Party of Guatemala that characterizes Federal Bureau of Investigation inquiries. The relations between the Communists and their permanent and temporary allies were not known from the inside. Indeed, there is not even extant a file of photographs of the leading Communist agents.

United States policy cemented the alliance of Communists and nationalists when a more discerning policy would have disrupted it. There is no criticism among North American businessmen in Guatemala of maintaining the good-neighbor policy by keeping aloof from Guatemalan affairs; it has paid off. But the intrigues of the Soviet Foreign Office, it is pointed out, are the business of all the 21 American republics.

COMMUNIST INTERVENTION

When relations deteriorated between him and the Arevalo administration, the Government charging that he was interfering in internal affairs because he protested the injustices done North American interests, the Communists intervened. Foreign Minister Gonzalez maintains that it was anti-Government extremists, i. e., rightists, who put Ambassador Patterson's life in danger. This is not true. The writer investigated all the anti-Government right-wing groups, particularly those of Gen. Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes and of Col. Miguel Mendoza. No North American ever was in danger from these groups.

The fact is that it was pro-Government extremists who threatened Mr. Patterson's life and even staged a public demonstration against him. It was the Communists. Senor Gonzalez knows—or should know—that his Government's security forces have evidence that the orders to the Communist Party of Guatemala to intervene in the Patterson dispute came from Moscow and were relayed through Communist headquarters in Mexico City.

The Communists themselves say that they gave Mr. Patterson "the Benes treatment." All that this involved could not be established, as the principals refuse to talk. Most of the details were traced out, however.

The Communists staged a demonstration near the presidential palace, carrying placards with extremist slogans, and the police had to disperse it. They painted offensive slogans on the United States Embassy and the Ambassador's residence. They threatened the Ambassador through anonymous telephone calls, which were ignored.

Finally, they threatened the assassination of the United States envoy, detailed a squad to carry it out—and let the names of the alleged executioners become known to the Government. None has yet been arrested, although all the details of the plot are known, including the place of ambush.

Foreign Minister Gonzalez Arevalo conveyed this information through his Embassy in Washington to the United States Government with the request that the envoy leave for his own safety, although it was bound to convey the false impression that the Ambassador had been intimidated. The request was transmitted to the envoy as an order. No one familiar with Communist affairs in Guatemala takes the plot seriously; it was a maneuver. Besides the Ambassador had an adequate marine guard.

The firm rejection of the Guatemalan request for Mr. Patterson's recall, which was interpreted there as possibly leading to a break in relations, caused dismay among the Communists as well as in Government circles. Evidently the Communists' orders were not intended to go so far.

At this point in his story, Mr. Lissner continued with the efforts of the then President Arevalo of Guatemala to avoid a break with the United States and to

proclaim that his Government wanted to maintain the best relations with this country.

Mr. Lissner reports further:

Dr. Arevalo referred to an occasion, perhaps 6 months ago, when Mr. Patterson, on instructions, called and informed the Chief Executive that cordial relations no longer existed between the two Governments. As he was leaving, Mr. Patterson added:

"Unofficially, Mr. President, I want you to know that so far as I am personally concerned, your Government will never get a dime or a pair of shoes from my Government until you cease the persecution of American business."

Ambassador Patterson, President Arevalo said, had threatened that if he had anything to do with it, the United States would cut off all aid to Guatemala. The President became indignant. Mr. Patterson did not represent Washington, the State Department, or the United States people, the President believed: "He represented Boston (the headquarters of the United Fruit Co.), he represented Wall Street."

COMMUNIST THREAT TO SECURITY

The correspondent replied that he did not know the attitude of Washington or of the State Department. But he did know the temper of the North American people, he added, and he was confident that they would not tolerate the giving of a dollar of aid from their hard-earned money to a country that harbored a Communist threat to continental security.

President Arevalo thought that one over. It remains to be seen, however, whether the question of policy involved, which may decide the success or the failure of the point-4 program, will be resolved on a realistic basis.

Mr. Speaker, those are the pertinent remarks of the New York Times regarding the services of Ambassador Patterson in Guatemala and the status of communism there.

Despite these facts objectively outlined by the great and unbiased New York Times, the Guatemalan Government has on several occasions had the effrontery to accuse Ambassador Patterson of plotting to overthrow that Government. This is a typical Communist brand smoke screen, and our State Department has categorically and properly denied each charge.

The entire Guatemalan situation has been reviewed amply and in detail on the floor of the House by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK] and in the Senate by Senator WILEY, an outstanding minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee. In each case the courageous role played in Guatemala by Ambassador Patterson was ably set forth. I shall not take your valuable time with repetitious detail.

For the past year, although he has continued as Ambassador to Guatemala, Ambassador Patterson has been stationed in Washington. It is gratifying, therefore, that now a man of his background in diplomacy and business and public service, and most important of all in the will to resist communism, has been assigned to that important world listening post, Switzerland.

Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Richard C. Patterson, Jr., as Minister to Switzerland serves plain notice to the world, and to the enemies of this Nation

and other free countries, that our President and our Secretary of State will not let appeasers and connivers drive from our public service men who, like Richard Patterson, have the courage to stand up and fight communism. His countrymen, with reason, are proud of Ambassador Patterson, and they know his continued service in our Government is a harsh blow to the Communist effort to dominate the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REDDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad to hear the gentleman from North Carolina make the able remarks he has made in regard to Ambassador Patterson. I know the ambassador personally. He is an outstanding American, a man who served not only with great distinction but with great courage as our Ambassador to Yugoslavia. I met him while he was Ambassador to Yugoslavia. Later he served in Guatemala, as the gentleman from North Carolina stated in his remarks, and he served there also with great distinction. If there was ever one thing that impressed me about Ambassador Patterson, aside from his unusual ability, his profound knowledge of international law, and his sterling Americanism, it is his courage. He knows communism. He knows the tactics of the Communists. He served our country in nations which were dominated by national Communist regimes, as distinguished from the international Communists. He knows communism and its tactics and its purposes. In his new position in Switzerland, a very important assignment today, with his background and knowledge and experience, he will continue to represent our country in a courageous manner and attain new heights. Our country is fortunate in having a man of the type of Dick Patterson.

I am pleased to join my friend from North Carolina in the justifiable observations he has made about Ambassador Patterson; and further, not only to congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina for his remarks, but to express my thanks for the proper commendation he has extended to this sterling American.

Mr. REDDEN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his fine statement. I assure him I am fully in accord with what he has said.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times.

Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Pointe Coupee Banner in reference to Col. Henry A. Rougon.

Mr. CROSSER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by the President of the United States.

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. FORRESTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks relative to the Price amendment.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in one a Senate concurrent resolution of the Iowa General Assembly and in the other an address by Prof. Clinton Rossiter.

Mr. VAN PELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include remarks made by John Trevor, of New York.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Spokane Spokesman-Review.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SHEEHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. JAVITS (at the request of Mr. Judd) was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include extraneous matter in three of them.

Mr. HILLINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOLDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a telegram.

Mr. AANDAHN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. OSTERTAG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and

include two excerpts from the Public Affairs Bulletin.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. HAND) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today and include additional matter.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ARENDS (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. PATTEN (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include additional matter; and in the event the cost exceeds the usual amount, that the extension may be made notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, for Friday, the 13th, and Monday, April 16, on account of absence from Washington.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTIONS, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 11. An act to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 108. An act to amend section 28 of the Enabling Act for the State of Arizona relating to the terms of leases of State-owned lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 109. An act to protect scenic values along the Grand Canyon Park South Approach Highway (State 64) within the Kaibab National Forest, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 260. An act to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Director of Public Health of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 263. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the apprehension and detention of insane persons in the District of Columbia, and providing for their temporary commitment in the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes," approved April 27, 1904, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 362. An act for the relief of Tu Do Chau (also known as Szetu Dju or Anna Szetu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 470. An act for the relief of Sister Bertha Pfeiffer and Sister Elzbieta Zabinska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 492. An act to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 573. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 672. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 699. An act for the relief of James M. Shellenberger, Jr., a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 803. An act to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 927. An act to amend section 6 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to permit the board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to transfer certain lands to the policy jury of the Parish of Rapides for use for holding livestock and agricultural exhibitions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution directing that there shall accompany every report of a committee of conference a statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the committee; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 599. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., assisting out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army Air Base, New Castle, Del.;

H. R. 1249. An act for the relief of the La Fayette Brewery, Inc.

H. R. 1479. An act for the relief of Joseph Bernstein;

H. R. 1682. An act for the relief of Capt. Marciano O. Garces;

H. R. 3040. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Ogden, Utah, to the Ogden Chamber of Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 13, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

379. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, relative to communications filed with the Clerk's office relating to a contest for a seat in the House of Representatives from the Twelfth Con-

gressional District of the State of Missouri in the Eighty-second Congress, between the Honorable Raymond W. Karst and Thomas B. Curtis (H. Doc. No. 111), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on House Administration, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 184. Resolution extending the time for taking testimony in the Macy versus Greenword election contest; without amendment (Rept. No. 315). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 379. An act to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of Labor; without amendment (Rept. No. 316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 197. Joint resolution to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports; without amendment (Rept. No. 318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee of conference. H. R. 1. A bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 319). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. EBERHARTER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1613. A bill to amend section 2883 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KING: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2746. A bill to amend section 2883 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 60. An act for the relief of Cilka Elizabeth Ingrova; without amendment (Rept. No. 317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 3669. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 3670. A bill to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 3671. A bill to credit certain service for automatic promotion purposes performed by employees of the postal field service in cases of transfers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 3672. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research and experiments with respect to methods of controlling and producing precipitation in moisture-deficient areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3673. A bill to authorize the appointment of one additional judge for the District of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON (by request):

H. R. 3674. A bill to establish principles and policies to govern generally the management of the executive branch of the Government in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 3675. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3676. A bill to place in the Administrator of General Services responsibility for coordination of certain miscellaneous activities in the District of Columbia in accordance with a recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 3677. A bill creating a Veterans' Insurance Corporation in the Veterans' Administration to exercise all of the functions with respect to Government life insurance and national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3678. A bill making certain changes in laws applicable to regulatory agencies of the Government so as to effectuate the recommendations regarding regulatory agencies made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 3679. A bill to provide for the creation of a Board of Analysis for Engineering and Architectural Projects and Drainage Area Advisory Commissions, in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3680. A bill to effectuate recommendations relating to the Department of the Interior of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3681. A bill to expand the activities of the Department of Labor in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3682. A bill to expand the activities of the Department of Commerce in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3683. A bill to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 3684. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of

the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3685. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Department of the Treasury in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3686. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Veterans' Administration in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3687. A bill to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3688. A bill to establish and to consolidate certain hospital, medical, and public health functions of the Government in a Department of Health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 3689. A bill to establish a Department of Social Security and Education in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 3690. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Displaced Persons Commission and the War Claims Commission to the Department of State, in accordance with a recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 3691. A bill making various changes in laws applicable to the Post Office Department in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3692. A bill to facilitate the financing of defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions, to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3693. A bill to grant succession to the War Damage Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 3694. A bill to suspend Federal price support for agricultural commodities during the present emergency; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE (by request):

H. R. 3695. A bill to extend the franking privilege to certain civil-defense agencies of the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia for the transmission of their official correspondence and informational matter without charge for postage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 3696. A bill to authorize a program for the dispersal of vital Federal agencies to sites outside of, but in the vicinity of, and accessible to the District of Columbia, for the decentralization of other Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAWSON (by request):

H. R. 3697. A bill to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government, and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 3698. A bill to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to purchase a tract of land; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3699. A bill to increase the maximum age limitation for veterans applicable to candidates for admission to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 3700. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 and to preserve the equities of permanent classified and unclassified civil-service employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished services of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAWSON (by request):

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution requesting the Secretary of State to submit to the Congress a plan for the establishment of a single foreign affairs career service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of Massachusetts Legislature for Congress to pass antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Massachusetts Legislature for Congress to authorize the construction of a Federal building in the city of Lawrence; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of Massachusetts Legislature for Congress to enact legislation to eliminate the income tax on profits from the sale of homes when occupied by their owners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Massachusetts Legislature for Congress to enact a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act with enforcement provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa making application to the Congress of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power to levy taxes and appropriate the revenue therefrom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 3701. A bill for the relief of Moy You Gam, also known as Moy Wing Tow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 3702. A bill for the relief of Jacob Shwimer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3703. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Corbett Mitchell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3704. A bill for the relief of Lovance I. Moran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 3705. A bill for the relief of William Mooney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 3706. A bill for the relief of John K. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 3707. A bill for the relief of Edgar L. Dimmick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 3708. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Goldie Weiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

220. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of residents of Melrose, Mass., urging Congress to roll back food prices to July 1, 1950, level; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

221. Also, resolution of Massachusetts Legislature memorializing Congress in opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance or socialized medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

222. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to pass antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 13, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, March 26, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who putteth down the mighty from their seat and exalteth the humble and the meek: Thou hast set eternity in our hearts. From the shams and shadows of these perplexing days we turn unfilled to Thee, praying for strength for our burdens, wisdom for our responsibilities, insight for our times, and vision which sets its eyes on far horizons.

In all the fever and fret of a confused day may we not forget that he that is slow to anger is better than the mighty, and he that ruleth his own heart better than he that taketh a city. Save us from lowering the shield of national unity and solidarity in a perilous hour, when the poisonous arrows of tyranny are being aimed by determined foes at the very life of this dear land of our hope and prayer. Teach us so to wait upon Thee that we may renew our strength, mount up with wings as eagles, run and not be weary, walk and not faint. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 13, 1951.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CARL HAYDEN, a Senator from the State of Arizona, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Thereupon Mr. HAYDEN took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 12, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2416. An act relating to exclusion from gross income of income from discharge of indebtedness;

H. R. 2654. An act to amend section 10 of Public Law 378, Eighty-first Congress; and

H. R. 3168. An act to amend section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3020) to authorize the printing of the annual reports of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America as separate House documents, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to present routine matters for the RECORD, without debate, and that the time be not charged to either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Fred J. Goffnelt, of Shepherd, Mich., relating to the repeal of certain paragraphs of the internal revenue law by which co-ops and others escape income taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Mothers' Club, of Queens, N. Y.,